

A STATUS AND VISION INVESTIGATION OF US UNIVERSITY

PIANO PEDAGOGY PROGRAMS

Hui-Ju Camille Fu, B.A., M.M.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

May 2007

APPROVED:

Debbie Rohwer, Major Professor and Chair of the
Division of Music Education

Warren Henry, Minor Professor

Joseph Banowetz, Committee Member

Brad Beckman, Committee Member

Donna Emmanuel, Program Coordinator

James C. Scott, Dean of the College of Music

Sandra L. Terrell, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse
School of Graduate Studies

Fu, Hui-Ju Camille. A status and vision investigation of US university piano pedagogy programs. Doctor of Philosophy (Music Education), May 2007, 308 pp, references, 94 titles.

The two major research questions were: “What is the current status of 20 prominent piano pedagogy programs?” and “what is the vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy program from the perspective of 20 piano pedagogy leaders?” Subjects were the leaders of the top 20 US university piano pedagogy programs. A survey study with interview questions was used as the instrument for the study.

The results showed that faculty, curriculum, and teacher training were three top factors that contributed to the quality of the programs. Most interviewed subjects held a doctoral degree in music. The curricular content and degree options were diverse across the selected programs. The content of teacher training included private and group teaching. The perceived best qualifications of a piano pedagogy instructor were to have a balanced education. Most programs had small or little to no budget, however, the preparatory program was perceived to be an enhancement to teacher training program finances. The greatest challenges were faculty acquisition and financial limitations. Gaining more money was the most common improvement priority for programs.

To envision an ideal future piano pedagogy program, most leaders stated that an ideal program should contain encourage: (1) collaborating with other divisions’ faculty members for developing a diverse curriculum, (2) providing multiple types of teacher training, (3) offering knowledge that is highly pertinent to students’ future careers, (4) continually adjusting topics in the curriculum, and (5) utilizing all the possible resources to establish up-to-date facilities. The chief obstacle was a lack of money. However, finding a major donor, and developing a preparatory program to generate money may help to overcome the obstacles. Having

administrators with positive attitudes toward pedagogy could help programs to gain more resources. Encouraging students to participate in workshops and conferences could enrich the training.

Several recommendations may help emerging pedagogy programs, such as : (1) raising faculty's visibility in public, (2) developing a diverse curriculum and collaborating with other faculty from different divisions, (3) establishing a preparatory program, (4) offering diverse degree options, (5) developing a general pedagogy degree, and (6) educating administrators on the importance of piano pedagogy.

Copyright 2007

by

Hui-Ju Camille Fu

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to express the deepest and utmost gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Debbie Rohwer, the Chair of Music Education, for her scholarly guidance, advising, patience, and encouragement that she provided throughout my entire doctoral and research work. Because of her guidance, I could fortunately understand the beauty of research and efficiently complete the journey of my work. She has been a great role model of being a professor and a friend. I hope that one day I can assist other students as she has assisted me.

A special thanks to my minor professor, Dr. Warren Henry, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, for his helpful insights and professional support to my study. Because of his unique viewpoints that have always pointed out the core issues, my study could be more scholarly presented. I wish to state my sincere appreciation to my piano professor, Mr. Joseph Banowetz, for the wise advice that he gave me during the interview phase of my study. Because of his suggestions I could prepare for interviewing my 20 subjects successfully. I would also like to thank my committee member, Dr. Brad Beckman, for his piano pedagogical input and consultation during the study. He helped me to understand the issues that have existed in the piano pedagogy field and provided me the contacts for the pedagogy organization and university professors.

Finally, I want to express my deepest acknowledgment to my husband, Arthur Pan. Without his unconditional love, taking care of my two kids, assisting me to analyze the data, helping me to organize all the papers, and refreshing my viewpoints while I was struggling during the study, this work would not exist.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Similarities and Differences in Piano Pedagogy Programs	2
New Trends in Pedagogy Curricula	7
The Vision of Future Programs in the Music Field	8
The Vision of Future Programs in Non-Music Fields	9
Conclusions	10
Limitations of the Study	12
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
Introduction	13
Historical Research	13
Piano Pedagogy Curricula	17
The Use of New Technology in Piano Pedagogy	24
Teacher Training	25
Piano Pedagogy Program Instructors	28
Proceedings of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy	30
Group Piano Instruction	32
Vision in the Music Field	34
Vision in Non-Music Fields	36
3. METHODOLOGY	40
Introduction	40
Research Method	40
Subjects	41
Measurement Instrument	44
Equipment	49
Data Collection	50
Data Analysis	52
Validity and Reliability	53

	Results for the Pilot Test Participants	60
	Strength	61
	Curriculum	62
	Teacher Training	62
	Instructors	63
	Finance	63
	Technology	64
	Largest Challenge to Programs	65
	Improvement	65
	Ideal Program	66
	Ideal Degree	67
	Possible Obstacles to Obtaining Ideal Programs	68
	Possible Solutions to Ideal Programs	69
4.	RESULTS	71
	Strengths	73
	Subjects' Educational Backgrounds	79
	Curriculum Content	80
	Teacher Training	91
	Instructor's Qualifications	96
	Technology	103
	Largest Challenges to Programs	108
	Improvements to Programs	111
	Ideal Programs	114
	Ideal Degrees	118
	Possible Obstacles to Obtaining Ideal Programs	123
	Possible Solutions to Ideal Program Obstacles	126
	Conclusion	129
5.	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	130
	Introduction	130
	Conclusion	132
	Future Research	141

Appendices

A.	LIST FOR THE 20 UNIVERSITY NAMES.....	144
B.	THE PARTICIPANTS OF NATIONAL GROUP PIANO AND PIANO PEDAGOGY FORUM OF 2002	146
C.	EMAIL LETTER FOR THE RECOMMENDERS	150
D.	DIRECTORY OF PIANO PEDAGOGY OFFERINGS IN AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES	152
E.	EMAIL LETTER TO LEADERS OF THE 20 TOP PIANO PEDAGOGY PROGRAMS.....	159
F.	CONSENT FORM FOR THE 29 PIANO PEDAGOGUES	161
G.	CONSENT FORM FOR 20 PIANO PEDAGOGY PROGRAMS' LEADERS	164
H.	TRANSCRIPT MARKINGS.....	167
I.	20 SUBJECTS INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS.....	169
	REFERENCES	302

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

University-based piano pedagogy programs are a relatively new phenomenon in academia. Piano pedagogy courses began in the normal schools at the turn of the 20th century, and piano pedagogy programs have existed in the music schools of United States universities for almost one hundred years (Uszler & Larimer, 1984).

In light of the newness of piano pedagogy as an educational program, Chronister (1988), the president of the Piano Pedagogy National Conference, highlighted the challenges of young programs at the 1988 biannual convention by stating “our biggest problems are generated by the fact that pedagogy as a discipline has grown up too fast and not yet formed its character and personality. It is besieged by the kind of confusion and consternation that always accompanies growth” (p. 78). Cameron (1983) also noted this problem by stating that “piano pedagogy is like a discipline in search of its own identity” (p. 401).

In response to the novelty of young pedagogy programs, many research studies have described the basic setup of current piano pedagogy programs in order to provide a more clear view of university piano programs across the nation. By understanding the status of piano pedagogy programs, music administrators, educators, piano pedagogues, and piano performers can define the identity of piano pedagogy programs, and possibly establish a more comprehensive piano pedagogy program for the future.

In general, descriptive research studies in the area of piano pedagogy have investigated the following topics: (1) historical studies investigating the developments and factors that have influenced the growth of piano pedagogy programs (Brubaker, 1997; Monsour, 1962; Richards, 1967; Uszler & Larimer, 1984); (2) biographical studies of prominent and influential piano

pedagogues and their contributions and influences on piano pedagogy programs (Fast, 1997; Trice, 1988); (3) philosophical studies on the topic of piano teaching strategies (Francis, 1992); (4) survey studies of (a) piano pedagogy curricula at all university levels in light of the national guidelines for piano pedagogy programs provided by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) (Charoenwongse, 1999; Johnson, 2003; Milliman, 1992; Paganelli, 1981); (b) seminar topics at National Piano Pedagogy Conferences from 1981 to 1995 (Montandon, 1999); (c) university piano pedagogy instructors (Kowalchuk, 1989; Lancaster, 1979; Shook, 1993); (d) the profile and educational training of independent piano teachers (Camp, 1976; McCain, 1994; MTNA 1990; Wolfersberger, 1988); (e) piano pedagogy internship programs from administrators' viewpoints (Lyman, 1991); and (f) the use of new technology in piano pedagogy programs (McArthur, 1992; Renfrow, 1991). These research studies have provided a general view of the status of United States piano pedagogy programs.

Similarities and Differences in Piano Pedagogy Programs

The studies that have described the status of piano pedagogy programs have noted many similarities and differences that seem to be in existence across university settings. For instance, the studies that have looked at piano pedagogy programs have found a similarity to be that most music schools do offer piano pedagogy courses and degrees, but also have found a difference to be that the titles of the degrees offered and the beginning to advanced level pedagogical courses that were offered varied based on individual institutions.

The varied degree titles reflect the purpose of individual degrees offered by institutions. Overall, the varied degree titles have included: “major in piano pedagogy; major in group piano pedagogy; major in piano performance with a pedagogy emphasis; major in music education

with a piano pedagogy emphasis; concentration in piano pedagogy and literature” (Uszler & Larimer, 1984, p. 11-12). Uszler and Larimer (1984) stated that the varied degree titles were influenced by the different philosophies of individual institutions.

In addition to the variety of degree titles offered by individual institutions, another notable difference between institutions has been whether a piano pedagogy program should have its own degree. While more and more pianists have advocated the importance of establishing piano pedagogy programs and offering major degrees at the undergraduate and graduate levels (Uszler and Larimer, 1986), others have stated that piano pedagogy programs should not operate separate from performance programs (Alexander, 1992). The issue has been that piano students at the undergraduate level should learn pedagogical knowledge and performance skills at the same levels regardless of the major. Charoenwongse (1999) claimed that a good piano teacher should have both educational knowledge and a high quality performance skill. As Alexander (1992) advocated, the best way for pianists to be teachers is to merge performance and pedagogy degrees into a single degree to help students obtain both the highest performance and teaching skill.

When comparing curricula of university piano pedagogy programs across the United States, many similarities and differences can also be found across piano pedagogy programs. Across schools, NASM (2003) required that in the bachelors degree, the undergraduates focus on a balance between performance skills and pedagogy knowledge. Uszler and Larimer (1984) advocated that the undergraduates should receive broader professional education in music and should be required to perform at the same level as performance majors. Charoenwongse (1999) also supported that the common goal at this level should be to provide students with the highest qualified professional knowledge and performance ability.

However, the beginning to advanced level pedagogical courses that were offered were different across the nation (Charoenwongse,1999; Paganelli, 1981; Uszler & Larimer, 1984). The differences were because not every music school offered a piano pedagogy curriculum for undergraduates. In general, at the undergraduate level, most schools offered beginning-level pedagogy courses and the required hours were from 2-4 credits. However, according to NASM (2003) “although course work in pedagogy is common in the degree Bachelor of Music in Performance, some institutions delay until the graduate level the offering of degree programs in these specialties” (p. 86). As a result, some other schools did not offer pedagogy courses for undergraduates (Paganelli, 1981).

Although Uszler and Larimer (1986) advocated that undergraduates should receive broader training of comprehensive musicianship and performance skill, Uszler (1995) also advocated that the main purpose of piano pedagogy programs should be to prepare pianists to be independent piano teachers after they graduate. For those music schools that did not offer piano pedagogy programs at the undergraduate level, the undergraduates received no pedagogical training during college. Therefore, if piano students did not receive piano pedagogy training at the undergraduate level and did not continue advanced study, they did not experience preservice teaching prior to their real teaching after they graduated.

One of the reasons that has been cited for some schools not offering pedagogy courses has been because of a lack of appropriate pedagogy instructors (Charoenwongse,1999; Kowalchyk,1989). Kowalchyk found that many piano pedagogy instructors were trained and received degrees as performers, but not educators. Hence, the number of qualified pedagogy instructors in the study sample was limited. Kowalchyk also indicated that not every pedagogy program had full time pedagogy instructors. Also, in the annual meeting of the National

Conference on Piano Pedagogy (NCP), Chronister (1988) claimed that finding the right person to teach courses was a challenge to piano pedagogy programs because most pedagogy instructors were trained as performers, not pedagogues.

Another difference across piano pedagogy programs has been the content of piano pedagogy curricula. Several issues have appeared in research studies. Charoenwongse (1999) stated that an effective piano pedagogy program should cover these topics in pedagogy courses: “appropriate solo and ensemble teaching literature for individual students; philosophies and psychology of learning and teaching and their application to piano study; approaches and methods for various ages, levels for both individual and group setting; technology and MIDI applications for teaching piano; and business aspects of piano teaching and independent studio management; and observation, student teaching, and receiving critiques and evaluations from the pedagogy teacher” (p. 30).

However, many programs have had difficulty covering all of the topics. Research findings have highlighted various conflicts caused by several complex factors. Because many pedagogy programs have existed as a part of a performance division, the pedagogy programs have had limited financial resources to provide for their needs. For instance, Uszler and Larimer (1984) indicated that the types of courses that were offered were often affected by programs’ “faculty, administration, budget, student teaching resources, space, equipment, and library” (p. 12). If the financial resources were not sufficient for the piano pedagogy program, then offering appropriate courses to cover every topic in the curriculum was an impossibility.

Among the piano pedagogy curriculum topics, Uszler and Larimer (1984) recommended that a comprehensive pedagogy program should provide teacher training experiences with students from the beginning to advanced levels and in private and group piano settings.

However, a survey report done by the Music Teachers National Association (MTNA) (1990) revealed a low percentage of satisfaction by the independent piano teachers after they graduated based on their lack of teaching experiences during college. The results showed that the primary teacher training experience during college was the one-on-one setting, not a group piano setting and the primary teaching level for piano instruction was the elementary level.

Research has cited that teacher training experiences have not only been limited for the undergraduate level, but also insufficient for the graduate level. Lyman (1991) studied the teaching assistantship opportunities at piano pedagogy programs from a group of administrators' viewpoints and stated that opportunity for providing intern programs for teaching assistantship positions were limited. The administrators stated that the biggest problem with offering teaching assistantship positions was insufficient funds.

As Paulsen and Feldman (1995) said:

Courses or clinical experiences covering the research and skills of teaching are seldom part of a formal education. While a few future college teachers may have the experience of being a teaching assistant, the formal education and supervised training to become a TA is very limited.....When faculty are asked how they learned to teach, the primary response is that they imitated the teaching style of a favorite professor. (p. 131)

Wolfersberger (1988) stated that an effective program should offer training that would fit the students' needs. She claimed that the continuing growth of pedagogy programs occurred only when the pedagogy programs provided for the needs of the piano pedagogy students' future professions. The author stated that piano pedagogy programs should offer the appropriate course training for pedagogy students. However, because of the limitations of piano pedagogy programs, how to offer more teaching experiences in private and group settings for pedagogy students has been an important issue for piano pedagogy programs.

New Trends in Pedagogy Curricula

Beyond the basic similarities and differences that have existed in piano pedagogy programs, there have been new topics that challenge pedagogy curricula. The need to include different topics to curriculum content has made establishing a comprehensive piano pedagogy program even more complicated. For instance, during the late 20th century, new technology had a great impact on piano teaching (McArthur, 1992; Renfrow, 1991). In 1996, at the 72nd annual meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), Larsen delivered a speech called “preparing musicians and teachers for their musical future-the role of the musician in the 21st century: rethinking the core”. Larsen (1997) stated that:

From my point of view, we are only now ending a musical era that has occupied a thousand years of Western culture and beginning a new era built around acoustic sound....I am suggesting that we now have, alongside the core of classical music education, another core, and that is the core of produced sound.....the future of music education resides in teaching music rigorously and with the highest standards from both acoustic and produced sound cores. (p. 115)

Larsen emphasized that today's music students need to learn the current skills of music teaching. The traditional teaching skills like aural skills, performance skills, singing skills, and theory cannot be replaced. However, music students also have to learn new teaching skills related to produced sound.

Many pedagogy programs have started to face the reality that using new technology has become an important teaching tool and music educators have suggested that piano pedagogy students learn to utilize new technology alongside other required knowledge. Roberts (1983) stated that the new technology trend has encouraged educators to continue learning new teaching skills.

In addition, to reflect the technology trend, publications and conventions have begun to address this topic more consistently. Uszler (1991) published a chapter in the *Handbook of*

Music Research in which she promoted the need for research on technology for the piano pedagogy field. The MTNA has held symposia, which have featured computer-assisted technology instruction every year since 1988.

However, Renfrow (1991) found that only a few university piano pedagogy curricula have included computer technology. In Renfrow's study, piano pedagogy students felt uncomfortable applying technology to piano teaching. Renfrow recommended that knowledge of new technology should be included in future pedagogy curricula.

Since the beginning of the 21st century, not only has technology impacted piano pedagogy programs, but societal changes and the internet revolution have also challenged traditional piano teaching concepts. Johnson (2003) stated that new developments have occurred and piano pedagogues should be aware of them. He stated that the population of piano students has extended to preschool children and to adults; and new professional resources like on-line capabilities and the growth of on-line music organizations have changed the traditional learning approaches.

The Vision of Future Programs in the Music Field

In addition to describing the status of piano pedagogy programs, the future direction of piano pedagogy programs is another issue with which pedagogues are concerned because of the rapid growth of university piano pedagogy programs. In the music field, two non-research articles written by piano pedagogues have addressed the future of the piano pedagogy programs written by piano pedagogues. Holland (1997) discussed the mission of future piano pedagogy programs in the 21st century. He discussed the role piano pedagogy programs should play in society.

Larsen (1997) advocated that pedagogy programs should reform the teaching environment by combining the acoustic sound and produced sound for successfully preparing future piano teachers to face the 21st century environment. Because Larsen considered that the 21st century's environment was surrounded by produced sound, the context of music educational curriculum should expand to both acoustic and produced cores.

However, neither of these studies were research based. There is a need for more research that addresses the future direction of piano pedagogy programs. One related study was conducted by Christiansen (2002) for the music theater program at Indiana University. He concluded that to build a high quality theater program in the future, the school had to meet the requirements of the national standards. Students should be required to complete the knowledge of liberal arts and the training of theater programs at the undergraduate level.

The Vision of Future Programs in Non-Music Fields

In non-music fields, there have been several research studies investigating the vision of future programs (Friedlander, 1997; Holmes, 1992; Obeid, 1998; Willis, 2002). Friedlander (1997) and Willis (2002) studied teacher training programs and the application of teacher training programs to future educational systems. Holmes (1992) and Obeid (1998) described the dreams that educational leaders desired to establish for future educational systems and barriers that would need to be removed in order for these programs to succeed.

The studies focused on the relationship between the current status of the programs and the vision of future programs. The researchers investigated subjects' knowledge and opinions, training, and the status of the current educational programs. The studies suggested that in order to improve their future programs, the educators and students had to have knowledge of current

educational system (Friedlander, 1997; Willis, 2002) and some obstacles had to be removed from the existing systems (Holmes, 1992; Obied, 1998).

Studies of the vision of future programs in non-music fields have provided the researcher the motivation to investigate the vision of future university piano pedagogy programs. In addition, through the findings that were obtained by open-ended questionnaires (Friedlander, 1997), personal interviews (Holmes, 1992; Obeid, 1998), and case studies (Willis, 2002), the type of methodology and the design of research questions also provided the researcher the approaches that can be utilized and applied to study the vision of future university piano pedagogy programs.

Conclusions

Research has provided the status of university piano pedagogy programs, and developments and challenges that piano pedagogy programs have faced. These studies have provided us with information on what has been achieved and not been achieved in the development of piano pedagogy programs. But, as a novel program, confusion comes from the immaturity and inconsistency of the programs, or a lack of research basis from which to follow (Milliam, 1992). In addition, some research studies have focused on a particular perspective of piano pedagogy programs in selected universities. However, these findings have only pointed out the issues that have existed in the programs and the weakness of the programs that are in need of improvement, but there were no solutions provided. In addition, the individuals that have provided information for these studies have been instructors instead of those possibly in charge of direct change.

Furthermore, little research has described possible approaches to resolving any challenges that have been alluded to in the studies. Also, few studies have provided an administrative viewpoint to discuss the issues of future piano pedagogy programs. There is a need for studies that can (1) provide the characteristics and status that a recommended piano pedagogy program might have, or (2) provide a future direction for piano pedagogy programs and the possible obstacles that may occur in establishing an ideal piano pedagogy program.

While there are many things that have not been completely stabilized in the piano pedagogy field, it is important to have some guidelines for establishing an ideal pedagogy program and to envision the possible obstacles in the process of establishing an ideal piano pedagogy program. As a result, the current study seeks to investigate the status of piano pedagogy programs, the vision of future piano pedagogy programs, and the obstacles and possible solutions of establishing an ideal future piano pedagogy from the viewpoints of leaders of university piano pedagogy programs.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to interview the leaders whose piano pedagogy programs are the top 20 piano pedagogy programs in the nation as recommended by a group of piano pedagogy faculty members (1) to ascertain the status of their piano pedagogy programs and (2) to address their vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy program. The leaders will talk about the possible obstacles that might occur and possible solutions for establishing an ideal piano pedagogy program for the future. The findings may provide a model program for other music schools to consider.

Limitations of the Study

This study only focused on the 20 leaders' programs which were recommended by a group of piano pedagogues who were piano faculty members in universities or active piano pedagogues. The reason that the 20 universities were selected was because they were considered to be the universities with the best piano pedagogy reputation in the nation.

The study was limited to interviewing the 20 leaders of piano pedagogy programs from these selected universities. Other schools' leaders were not included. Therefore, the findings of the study or the suggestions for a future ideal piano pedagogy program only represent 20 leaders' viewpoints.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The research on piano pedagogy can be grouped into several areas including historical, piano pedagogy curricula, technology, training, instructors, conference proceedings, and group piano instruction. The research on these areas has presented a general view of piano pedagogy programs in the United States. The historical research has investigated the factors that have influenced the development of piano pedagogy programs from the late 19th century to today. The biographical research has described the prominent piano pedagogues' contributions to the piano pedagogy field. The philosophical research has presented the applications of philosophers' teaching strategies to piano teaching. The survey research has described the topics of curricula, instructors, conferences, training of pedagogy students and program vision related to university piano pedagogy programs. These studies have presented status, strength, weakness and issues that have existed, related to piano pedagogy programs.

Historical Research

Historical research studies have not only shown the concerns and factors that have led to the shifted trends in the piano pedagogy field but have also revealed the rapid growth and challenges that university piano pedagogy programs have faced. In the piano field before the late 19th century, the major style of piano teaching was primarily dominated by the traditional European style which was mainly performance-oriented and the focus was on repertoire and technique (Bashaw, 1980; Boardman, 1954; James, 1995; Norman, 1969).

In the late 19th century, several factors from different aspects influenced the normal schools to begin offering piano instruction for student teachers. The instruction in the normal school was primarily geared toward teaching young students in the public schools or private students (Monsour 1962; Richards, 1967; Uszler & Larimer, 1984). This instructional trend, called the class piano movement, later led to universities offering piano pedagogy courses for college pianists.

The class piano movement was also of utmost importance in the later development of collegiate piano pedagogy programs. Many research studies (Monsour, 1962; Richards, 1967; Uszler & Larimer, 1984) have stated that the class piano movement may have influenced the development of piano pedagogy programs in universities, for in order to provide pianists with the knowledge to teach students comprehensive musicianship through the piano, like the vocal and violin methods courses that were offered in the normal schools, music professors, supervisors, and publishers offered the philosophies, methodologies, learning theories and teaching experiences for pianists to teach class piano in the public schools. These topics became the basic content of piano pedagogy curricula at music schools in universities. The findings of research studies on the class piano movement (Monsour, 1962; Richards, 1967; Uszler & Larimer, 1984) have indicated that the class piano movement initiated the need for offering piano methods for group lessons in the normal schools to piano student teachers.

Monsour (1962), Richards (1967), and Uszler and Larimer (1984) investigated the historical factors that influenced the piano class movement and the development of piano pedagogy programs. Monsour (1962) investigated the piano class movement from 1915 to 1930. Richards (1967) studied the complete development of the piano class movement in the schools from 1815 to 1962. Uszler and Larimer (1984) stated that several historical factors led to the

booming of the class piano movement. Social factors included: (1) the piano industry which emphasized the enjoyment of piano playing and published different types of piano methods for piano teachers to use; (2) the return of instrumentalists from World War I which contributed to the development of instrumental playing in the public schools; (3) the musicians who retired from the military who taught students to play instruments; and (4) the booming of the middle class which allowed more people to afford music expenses. With all these social contributions that encouraged the joy of music making and with the promotion by the piano industry, more and more students participated in piano playing in the schools.

Monsour (1962) and Richard (1967) also highlighted academic factors that may have influenced the class piano movement. In class piano, students learned how to accompany singing, harmonize, improvise, compose, and transpose; the approaches were scientific, systematic and comprehensive. Therefore, they noted that when educators emphasized the importance of a scientific, systematic approach to teaching, more music educators advocated the benefits of class piano in the public schools. The training processes made students learn musicianship through the piano, instead of only focusing on technique in a private lesson. Also, music educators argued that traditional piano teaching in one-on-one settings was only for elite students. In addition, compared to private lessons, the fee for a group lesson was more affordable than the fee for a private lesson.

Monsour's (1962) and Richards' (1967) results showed that many of today's piano pedagogy program curricula may have been implemented, generated or re-organized by the curriculum content that was offered in the normal schools during the class piano movement 100 years ago. Many issues and topics that we discuss today seem to be similar to those that were discussed during the class piano movement.

Other factors were also noted by Uszler and Larimer (1984) in relation to the development of the class piano movement. Professional organizations promoted the establishment of piano pedagogy programs in universities. For instance, the growth of music associations, like the Music Supervisor's National Conference in 1907 and the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) in 1934, led to offerings of piano instructional courses for piano teachers and institutions. The music association not only provided information for establishing piano pedagogy programs, but also taught piano teachers the group piano methods for teaching class piano students.

Going beyond the influences of the class piano movement on the development of piano pedagogy programs in universities, Uszler and Larimer's (1984) results have provided a broader and more comprehensive historical view of the piano pedagogy program's development in United States universities. The study documented several milestones in the development of piano pedagogy programs from the early 19th century to the late 20th century, including the promotion of the music industry, the formation of the Music Teacher National Association, the standardization of the National Association of Schools of Music guidelines for piano pedagogy curriculum content, the establishment of the comprehensive musicianship concept, the influence of the preparatory divisions, the awareness of psychology and learning theories in piano teaching, and the use of new technology and electronic equipment as an instructional tool. These milestones may have influenced each other.

Another approach in viewing piano pedagogy program changes and trends is to study the development of piano methods because the development of piano methods may have reflected the major concerns in the piano pedagogy area at the time. In Brubaker's (1996) descriptive study, he analyzed piano methods that were published in the United States over the last 200

years. He analyzed the content, context and the teaching philosophy of individual series' of piano methods.

Brubaker found that piano methods in different times reflected cultural, social, and institutional values. Developmental and psychological learning theories, advanced technology, research agendas, scientific investigations and popular concert programs may have implemented and propelled the development of piano methods. By analyzing the developments and changes in published piano methods, Brubaker pointed out that after the 1960s, the new trends and challenges that piano pedagogy programs were facing were new technological developments, piano pedagogy training, and the business of piano teaching.

Especially in the area of technological development, Brubaker emphasized that piano teachers need to be exposed to computer or electronic technology in order to face the diverse population of students. He pointed out the use of new technology in the piano methods at the college level. Brubaker claimed that since new technology is applied in different piano methods, student teachers should be encouraged to integrate technology into their teaching.

Piano Pedagogy Curricula

Research studied on university piano pedagogy curricula have helped music educators, piano faculty members, piano pedagogy instructors, music administrators, pedagogy students, piano teachers and music publishers to know the degrees and curricular content that university piano pedagogy programs have offered. In addition, curricular design reflects the goals that a program desires to achieve. However, for young piano pedagogy programs, this identity may still be undetermined. Many challenges may still be in need of resolution. In this circumstance, it may be difficult to determine a standard piano pedagogy curriculum at the university level.

The lack of a standard curriculum may be due to the short history and rapid growth of university piano pedagogy programs. In university piano pedagogy programs initiated in the late 19th century, music schools offered single courses to teach piano methods for music educators and pianists. In the mid-20th century, many universities began offering piano pedagogy courses for the piano performance degree, and some universities even offered a degree in piano pedagogy. However, there were no clear guidelines for the curriculum. To react to the fast growth of piano pedagogy programs in universities, Uszler (1985) stated that the annual meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) in 1953 suggested the establishment of a curriculum for training piano performers to be piano teachers and the panel argued for an appropriate organization for providing certificate programs for private piano teachers. In 1956, NASM suggested establishing a four-year bachelors curriculum for music education majors in applied music. Sturm, James, Jackson, and Burns (2000/2001) stated that curriculum at that time included teaching methods for private and group instruction, courses for professional development, the business of the teaching profession, and teaching seminars.

In 1985, to react to the needs of training pianists to be independent university piano teachers, the NASM handbook included guidelines for piano pedagogy degrees. The handbook included competencies, standards, guidelines and recommendations at the bachelors and masters levels. It described the requirements of courses, ensemble experiences, recitals, internships, and the percentage of each subject in the curriculum content for the pedagogy degree.

Comparing curricular content at the undergraduate and graduate levels, the handbook added a research component to the graduate curricula at the masters level. At the doctoral level, the design of the program was intended to vary for each individual student. Faculty were

encouraged to understand individual student needs in order to develop the most advanced qualities in student musicians.

One of the early important investigations of U.S university piano pedagogy programs across the nation, Uszler and Larimer presented a research study called the *Handbook of the information and guidelines of the piano pedagogy major in curriculum* part I at the undergraduate level in 1984 and part II at the graduate level in 1986 to the members of the Committee on Administration/Pedagogy Liaison. These two handbooks of university piano pedagogy programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels investigated the curricular content of selected programs. The information and guidelines of the piano pedagogy major in curriculum part I at the undergraduate level (1984) included the study of piano pedagogy history and five case studies of selected piano pedagogy programs. The information and guidelines of the piano pedagogy major in curriculum part II at the graduate level (1986) included case studies of selected piano pedagogy programs for the masters degree in piano pedagogy.

In the *Information and guidelines of the piano pedagogy major in curriculum part I at the undergraduate level*, Uszler and Larimer (1984) selected five case studies based on pedagogy programs offering a major degree in piano pedagogy and compared their curricular content. Uszler and Larimer compared the similarities and differences among the five selected piano pedagogy programs. In general, the five piano pedagogy programs followed the general guidelines of NASM. The results found that piano instruction and methods offered by the programs were primarily emphasizing the precollege-age student level. The lengths of practical teaching experiences were at least four semesters, and supervised student teaching on a particular level was at least one semester.

But, the findings indicated some differences including: (1) pedagogy courses were offered in different years; (2) not every school had enough piano pedagogy instructors to offer varied courses, (3) not every piano pedagogy program offered student teaching from the beginning to advanced levels; (4) not every pedagogy program had chances to observe independent studio teaching in the community; and (5) not every program provided a teaching internship in a real setting outside of campus.

After comparing the curricular content of the selected piano pedagogy programs, Uszler and Larimer pointed out several weaknesses that existed in the selected programs and made recommendations for improvement. Uszler and Larimer stated that psychological leaning theory should be required in the curricular content. The programs should focus on hands-on teaching experiences as well as learning and performance. Instructional techniques should be emphasized in both private and group settings. Is hoped the findings would help other piano pedagogy programs to establish an effective piano pedagogy program.

The information and guidelines of the piano pedagogy major in curriculum part II at the graduate level (Uszler & Larimer, 1986) provided three model case studies through reviewing almost two dozen piano pedagogy programs offering piano pedagogy degrees at the masters level. Uszler and Larimer (1984) described that the courses at the graduate level focused on the specialized major field more intensely than the courses at the baccalaureate level. As they said:

The course work and the directed teaching experiences should focus more on the teaching of adult students as well as on materials and teaching techniques appropriate to dealing with advancing levels of performance. In addition, the study of learning theories as applied to the teaching of piano performance as well as the survey of methods and literature should be in greater depth and specificity. (p. 4)

Further, Uszler and Larimer stated that courses should prepare teachers to understand the plan of curriculum development in varied settings. The programs had to provide different types of teaching experiences to students.

However, the results indicated that individual piano pedagogy programs dealt with pre-qualifications for entering degree programs differently. The main problem was that not every school had piano pedagogy degrees at the undergraduate level. Therefore, for the students who did not receive a piano pedagogy degree at the undergraduate level, but wanted to obtain a masters degree in piano pedagogy, every school had different requirements for handling the different pre-qualifications. Some schools had particular courses for fulfilling the deficiencies that did not lead toward the degree credits. Some schools counted the deficiencies toward degree credits. However, other schools did not require piano pedagogy knowledge prior to graduate study and offered courses from the beginning level to the higher advanced level. The findings indicated that the training that graduate piano pedagogy major students received was not at the same level.

Moreover, Uszler and Larimer (1986) indicated that the diverse student population at the masters level was another challenge to piano pedagogy programs. Uszler and Larimer pointed out that students who just completed the bachelors degree and entered the masters degree had different needs than students who had earned the bachelors degree previously and had come back for a more advanced level of study. Therefore, it was difficult to provide a standard curriculum that would suit diverse students' needs.

To react to the challenges, Uszler and Larimer (1986) indicated that some schools were intending to establish a more flexible curriculum for diverse student populations. A flexible curriculum meant that the required courses depended upon the individual students' background

training, experiences, interests and needs. Based on the individual needs, schools hired full-time faculty, part-time instructors, or specialists to guide individual students. As a result, the findings indicated that the goals for piano pedagogy programs varied across each institution.

A similar study was done by Charoenwongse (1999), who compared piano pedagogy course content in the United States through analyzing syllabi and survey questionnaires. The results showed a similar general curriculum content offered by the selected piano pedagogy programs. At the undergraduate level, the similarities of curricular content across the schools included: learning theory and its application, current methods from elementary through intermediate levels, observations in diverse settings, supervised student teaching, teaching experiences for individual and group lessons, resource availability from preparatory divisions, facilities for pedagogy libraries and laboratories, four years of piano performance study and a requirement of one final recital.

However, the results also found that piano pedagogy courses were not required by every school. Charoenwongse indicated that piano pedagogy courses were not necessarily required by every music school mainly due to a lack of piano pedagogy instructors. Some music schools did not offer piano pedagogy courses for pianists until the graduate level. Therefore, to teach with different graduate students' background training in mind, the curricular content and context of pedagogy courses that were offered were not the same.

In addition, Paganelli (1981) found that schools offered pedagogy courses in different years. Some schools offered courses in the junior year; some offered courses in the senior year. Student teaching was not necessarily included in pedagogy courses. Some schools had separate courses for student teaching. Observations of practical teaching at different student levels and in different settings were not always required by all piano pedagogy programs, either. Elementary

level teaching in a private setting was the only level and setting that was offered by most piano pedagogy programs.

To compare the status of pedagogy programs at the graduate level, Milliman (1992) did a survey study of graduate piano pedagogy core course offerings in universities. The questionnaires were sent to piano pedagogy instructors. When the researcher asked the piano pedagogy instructors which course topics should be covered in the curriculum, the results showed that although piano pedagogy instructors all agreed on the importance of teacher training for graduate piano students, instructors had a difficult time agreeing on what specific course content should be covered.

Milliman pointed out that one of the problems was because there were no research studies that provided piano pedagogy instructors a guideline to offer courses at the graduate level. Haug (1991) agreed with this concern by claiming that the difficulty of finding a standard curriculum content was caused by the lack of piano pedagogy research at the graduate level. As a result, piano pedagogy instructors were not sure about what type of course content was desired by or most appropriate for graduate students.

Moreover, the different levels of piano pedagogy background training that graduate students received at undergraduate schools varied greatly. Some had little knowledge of piano pedagogy while others had more intensive knowledge. This situation made the consensus of course content by piano pedagogy instructors even more difficult. The piano instructors had difficulty offering a united curriculum content, which could cover every student need.

In addition to the differences across piano pedagogy programs, social and technological changes have been continuing challenges to young piano pedagogy programs. Johnson (2003) investigated the status of undergraduate piano pedagogy programs in selected universities. The

questionnaires were sent to piano pedagogy instructors to gather information on piano pedagogy instructors' backgrounds, the core course topics, and teacher training and observation experiences in the core courses. The respondents pointed out that because of social changes, the piano student population had expanded to preschool and adult levels. Hence, Johnson advocated that curricular content in the 21st century should expand to preschool children and adult populations.

The Use of New Technology in Piano Pedagogy

Research studies have found that music educators and piano pedagogy instructors have advocated the application of new technology to music teaching. Larson (1997) pointed out that the environment where we live is surrounded by produced sound and music teachers cannot ignore the impact of produced sound on the music field. Since the mid-20th century, the emergence of the use of electronic equipment like computer software programs, electronic laboratories, and audio and video recordings has challenged the traditional piano teaching approach. Many piano pedagogues have advocated the importance of incorporating technology into the piano teaching field (Brubaker, 1997; Charoenwongse, 1999; Johnson, 2003; Uszler, 1992). In addition, music publishers have published piano methods with discs or midi-discs for enhancing piano students' learning outcomes and interests (McArthur, 1992). As a result, many music educators have considered the importance of implementing technology-based curricular content for training future teachers. Robert (1983) encouraged piano teachers to obtain technological skills for use in their daily teaching.

Indeed, piano pedagogy programs have begun to be aware of incorporating computer and keyboard technology knowledge into curricular content. Renfrow (1991) studied the use of

computer and keyboard technology in graduate piano pedagogy programs. The topics of the study included (1) graduate piano pedagogy students' knowledge of using computer and keyboard technology; (2) the computer and electronic keyboard technology offerings within piano pedagogy courses; and (3) piano pedagogy instructors' and experts' attitudes and opinions toward new technology.

The results indicated that graduate piano pedagogy students received little knowledge about computers and new technology. The primary reason was due to piano pedagogy instructors lacking course training and technological familiarity. Piano pedagogy students agreed with the need for incorporating technology into piano teaching but they felt uncomfortable using computer technology skills in their teaching. Although the results showed that the piano pedagogy instructors paid very little attention to technology, they did consider the importance of the knowledge. To encourage the use of technology in piano teaching, Renfrow (1991) stated that “ piano pedagogy programs must take the lead in computer and keyboard technology education because they are training the independent studio teacher, applied piano teachers, and piano pedagogy instructors of the future” (p. 8). Johnson (2003) agreed that the application of new technology to piano teaching should also be emphasized by piano pedagogy instructors. In addition, the use of on-line resources may be another new teaching approach for future piano teachers.

Teacher Training

One of the approaches that has been used to improve piano pedagogy programs is to study the background training and career needs of independent piano teachers. By doing so, piano pedagogy programs can cover what type of training may be best for piano teachers' needs.

Camp (1976) studied private piano teachers' piano pedagogy training in music education. Through questionnaires, the respondents indicated that in order to enhance the quality of independent piano teachers, several topics needed to be improved in the piano pedagogy programs, including: certificate programs, workshops, professional organizations, pedagogy degrees, teaching approaches, and advanced study. Camp considered that the piano teacher played an important role in music education because piano students are a large population. He stated that the training and experiences that private piano teachers receive determines the quality of teaching that the private teachers can offer to students.

A study done by the Music Teacher National Association (MTNA) (1990) provided a picture of the training that independent piano teachers had received in piano pedagogy programs. MTNA investigated piano teachers' satisfaction with their own piano pedagogy training during college and their post-graduation career concerns. The survey results showed low satisfaction with teacher training in piano pedagogy programs. Among all piano teachers, more than 50% of the piano teachers who had bachelors degrees in music took a piano pedagogy course at the undergraduate level. Fifty-three percent of piano teachers with masters degrees received pedagogy courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The teachers with doctorates provided similar results, and 55% of all piano teachers had hands-on teacher training prior to teaching the piano. The respondents felt that their pedagogy training was insufficient during college, and their pedagogy training did not fulfill their career needs after graduation.

In terms of hands-on teacher training, the results showed that observation of an experienced teacher was a core component of teacher training. However, the majority of observations were only for teaching beginning-level students. Teachers who earned masters or doctoral degrees were often the only ones who had the chance to observe experienced teachers of

advanced students. In addition, the observation of group teaching was not prevalent in most piano pedagogy training settings. Many of the teachers who reported having the experience of observing class piano teaching were younger teachers. The findings indicated that hands-on teacher training experiences in different settings were ignored or lacking in most piano pedagogy programs.

One related study was conducted by Wolfersberger (1988). To investigate piano teachers' background training and career satisfaction, Wolfersberger (1988) surveyed piano teachers about the business of teaching. Several purposes were cited in the study including: (1) to see whether being a piano teacher was the participant's first career choice; (2) income levels; (3) educational training; and (4) professional practice. The results indicated that less than 50% of teachers considered being a piano teacher as their first career choice. The average piano teacher income was more than \$45,000 a year. Most of the piano teachers had pedagogical training.

In light of piano teachers' professional practices, the results found that transposition, piano ensemble experience, composition, improvisation, and jazz and rock idioms were the weakest subjects among the teachers. Many of the piano teachers had deficiencies in educational psychology and computer technique. Wolfersberger recommended that piano pedagogy programs improve these subjects for recruiting more piano pedagogy students in the future.

One of the topics that piano pedagogy programs offered for training pianists at the graduate level to obtain practical teaching experiences was through offering teaching assistantship positions. Lyman (1991) studied intern teaching programs from an administrative viewpoint and stated that The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy strongly endorsed the importance of intern teaching in the piano pedagogy curriculum. But the findings showed that

funds to pay intern teaching in diverse settings like laboratory programs, preparatory departments, and independent piano studios were limited. The findings indicated that most intern supervisors were overloaded and under-compensated.

Piano Pedagogy Program Instructors

The qualifications of piano pedagogy instructors may be one of the factors that determines whether a piano pedagogy program is successful or not. Researchers have shown an interest in studying the profile of university piano pedagogy instructors' skills, including the instructors' educational training, interests, teaching loads, income levels, gender types, and their concerns and hopes for the programs. Charoenwongse (1999) indicated that one of the factors that caused inconsistency across piano pedagogy programs was the lack of appropriate piano pedagogy instructors. The results found that most piano pedagogy instructors were trained by piano performance majors. In the study, the piano pedagogy instructors had mainly one-on-one teaching experiences and their concept of piano teaching was performance-oriented. Because they did not receive enough pedagogical or educational training, they had limited knowledge offering pedagogical or educational courses. Also, Johnson's (2003) study indicated that most of the piano pedagogy instructors held doctorate degrees in piano performance, not in piano pedagogy.

Kowalchuk's (1989) studied the status of piano pedagogy instructors through a survey questionnaire. The findings showed that piano pedagogy instructors were mainly trained as performers. The instructors were not trained to teach piano pedagogy. Moreover, although most piano pedagogy instructors had no educational training, they were interested in teaching pedagogy courses and had to prepare alone for teaching classes such as group piano, applied

piano, piano literature, psychology and learning theory. In addition, when respondents were asked to define and to evaluate the differences between performance faculty and pedagogy faculty, many respondents still viewed piano pedagogy instructors as having a lower-level of performance skill.

Research studies have indicated that finding appropriate piano pedagogy instructors to teach piano pedagogy courses has become a challenge to many piano pedagogy programs. Uszler and Larimer (1984) found that many schools did not have enough full-time piano pedagogy instructors. Some music schools offering a piano pedagogy degree only had one full time piano pedagogy instructor in charge of the entire program. Chronister (1988) claimed that the problem was because the piano pedagogy curriculum had not been well established yet because anyone who can play the piano can teach piano pedagogy courses. The primary instructors of pedagogy courses depended upon which performance faculty's turn it was to teach the course during that particular semester.

To resolve the issue of inappropriate piano pedagogy instructors teaching pedagogy students, the goal has been to successfully train future piano pedagogy instructors. Shook (1993) studied undergraduate piano pedagogy instructor competencies, teaching experiences and background training. Questionnaires were sent to university level piano pedagogy instructors. The respondents were asked to determine the importance of experiences and knowledge in the areas of administration, general knowledge, studio management, and studio teaching as a piano pedagogy instructor for preparing future piano pedagogy instructors at the undergraduate level. Respondents indicated that graduate study was the best training for preparing future undergraduate piano pedagogy instructors. The most beneficial topics for training future piano

pedagogy instructors were performance skill development, piano literature, teaching methods, learning theory and student teaching.

Proceedings of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy

The topics that have been discussed in the piano pedagogy conferences reflect the major concerns that have existed in the piano pedagogy field. Different topics that have been discussed in the different times also reveal that trends have shifted in different periods. In addition, the numbers of participants that have attended the conferences and the papers that have been submitted to the conference can also reveal the growth and the development of university piano pedagogy programs. Through studying the proceedings of conferences, it may help researchers to have a more clear view of the development of piano pedagogy programs.

To react to the fast growth of university piano pedagogy programs in universities, Chronister and Lyke invited a group of piano pedagogues to discuss university piano pedagogy programs in universities in 1979. In the next year, this group of piano pedagogues, lead by Chronister, established the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy (NCPPI). NCPPI was the first nation-wide and influential organization in the piano pedagogy field. The conference was held biannually and the purpose was to provide and discuss piano pedagogy-related issues.

The major missions of NCPPI were to help piano teachers to prepare effectively for the teaching profession and improve pedagogy programs in order to face rapid societal changes (Chronister, 1988). Until the NCPPI conference in 1994, the growth of the NCPPI reflected a dramatic development of pedagogy programs and the topics of discussion centered upon complex issues that consistently challenged piano pedagogy programs. The participants were independent piano teachers, piano faculty and music educators from different states of the

country. The NCPP provided a place for piano pedagogy teachers, independent piano teachers and division directors to exchange their professional opinions (Shook, 1993). According to Chronister (1995) the reason that NCPP ended was due to “financial problems caused by the increasing size and complexity of the meetings” (p. 2). In 2001, the Frances Clark Center began housing NCPP.

The increasing number of participants paralleled the rapid growth of piano pedagogy programs in universities. The directory that was published by the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy in 1991 showed that the number of schools that offered piano pedagogy courses was more than 300. Among these schools, 186 music schools offered a degree with a piano pedagogy emphasis at the undergraduate level. At the graduate level, 92 music schools offered a degree with a piano pedagogy emphasis at the masters degree level and 17 music schools offered a degree with a piano emphasis at the doctoral degree level. The number of participants had grown from 61 participants in 1979 to over 700 participants in 1990 and the participants were from different states and different countries worldwide (Renfrow, 1991).

The topics of the *Proceedings of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy* have presented trends and concerns in the piano pedagogy field. Montandon (1999) studied the trends through the *proceedings of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy*, 1981-1995. She reported that practice teaching and pedagogy curriculum programs were the two topics that had been addressed the most frequently in the history of the conference. She stated that after the 1970s, curriculum content and certificate programs were the major concerns in the field. The age of piano students had expanded to adult and preschool students and the curriculum content also had increased to enhance the quality of the piano pedagogy programs. The issue of

certificate programs for independent piano teachers enhanced the quality of independent piano teachers.

The frequency of the topics that had been discussed in the NCPP revealed the strengths and weaknesses in the field. Montandon (1999) found that the topics that were addressed by the seminar the most often were practice teaching, pedagogy curriculum program, technology, learning theories, literature and performance. She found that several issues that appeared through the study of NCPP's proceedings were (1) the changes from pedagogy topics to performance topics in the last two meetings; (2) the lack of research papers; (3) the teacher-centered curriculum design and (4) the lack of self-analyzing discussion in the piano teaching field. Finally she indicated that the four major factors that had influenced piano pedagogy programs were: “ (a) the evaluation and revision of the philosophy, purpose and practice of piano instruction; (b) the identification and examination of the piano teaching profession; (c) the production of teaching materials; (d) the role of the music industry” (p. 19).

Group Piano Instruction

Group piano instruction is a major topic of interest in piano pedagogy curriculum development. Music Teachers National Association (MTNA) (1990) found that compared to the traditional one-on-one piano instruction, independent piano teachers had less experience in group piano instruction. In addition, the curricular content of piano pedagogy programs emphasized few group piano instruction and group piano teaching experiences. However, Camp (1976) indicated that offering group piano instruction and hands-on teaching experiences had become one of the demands for future piano pedagogy programs.

Uszler and Larimer (1984) stated that the teaching of group piano instruction began around 1815 by Logier in Dublin. Soon after Logier promoted the benefits of group piano class teaching, many piano teachers came from different states to study the group piano class method with him. Since then, group piano has become more and more popular. But, even with the history of group piano instruction, group piano instruction in piano pedagogy programs has still received less emphasis than one-on-one instruction (MTNA, 1990). The need for teaching in group settings has been cited as one of the topics that many piano pedagogues have desired to improve (Banowetz, 1973; Bastien, 1973; Lyke, 1968; Richards, 1967).

Richards' (1967) historical study noted that the piano class movement caused great demands on group piano instructors at the beginning of the 20th century because the schools needed more piano teachers who had knowledge in group piano teaching for conducting piano classes in schools. But the results found that piano pedagogy programs in universities did not have adequate training for teaching group piano class. Lyke (1968) stated that because of the lack of adequate group piano training, many group piano teachers still used one-on-one teaching techniques and methods to teach group piano students. He recommended that piano pedagogy courses should provide information on helping pianists to identify problems and improve teaching techniques for group piano teaching.

Banowetz (1973) advocated the importance of training college pianists to be group piano instructors because of the high market demands. Bastien (1973) also felt that pianists should be trained to teach in group piano settings. He stated that the biggest issue with group piano teaching was inefficient group piano instructors. He claimed that the majority of piano teachers were trained to be performers or private piano teachers and were not prepared for teaching group piano. The piano teachers were not familiar with the procedures of group piano teaching.

Lancaster (1979) indicated that a new attitude had appeared at the end of the 1960s. He developed a hypothetical model program for educating university piano pedagogy instructors. After instructors received the hypothetical model program, the results indicated that more piano teachers were interested in the approaches, techniques, methods, and organization of group piano teaching. Piano pedagogy courses in universities started to emphasize group piano teaching. The piano pedagogy instructors agreed that group piano teaching ability would broaden piano teachers' career opportunities. The teachers felt that if pianists received more piano pedagogy training in group piano instruction at the graduate level, they should also have the opportunity to teach undergraduate group piano classes. Lancaster recommended that piano pedagogy programs should have a separate course on the topic of teaching group piano.

Vision in the Music Field

Most research studies in the piano pedagogy field have stated the status of piano pedagogy programs. One study in the music field, done by Christiansen (2002), went beyond status to study the vision of the Indiana University music theater program. Christiansen designed a guideline for establishing the music theater program at Indiana University by studying the unique elements of three prominent music schools offering music theater degrees in the United States.

Christiansen sent out questionnaires to 202 schools offering music theater degrees which were listed in the College Music Society Directory (2001). Twenty-three music schools responded to the study. After reviewing the qualifications of the 23 music schools, the researcher focused on three prominent music theater programs (Florida State University, University of Michigan, and University of Cincinnati) because of the possible application of their characteristics to the future music theater degree at Indiana University.

Several similar characteristics with Indiana University were considered by the researcher. The similar characteristics were the large size of the student body and schools, whether the school was public or private, or religious or non-religious, whether the school had a national reputation or not, the region of students (national or international), and the university reputation.

For instance, Michigan, Florida State and Cincinnati were public universities with four-year programs and the enrollment of undergraduate students was more than 20,000 every year. The diverse students' ethnic background included more than 17% minority from the United States and international students. The three universities offered degrees in music performance, theater and dance. All three offered numerous performances, recitals and concerts every year in the community, and the communities had solid support for the universities.

Through the data that Christiansen obtained, he stated that the three music schools had strict audition processes to select limited students. Students were required to take singing, dancing and acting courses after they entered the programs. Beside the required courses of singing, dance and acting, students were required to take credits of music theory, instruments, or history as requirements or electives. The schools also offered courses to teach audition technique for students to enter the professional world. All three music schools hired music theater specialists to teach music theater courses.

To apply the information that was gained from the three universities to Indiana University, Christiansen described that in order to establish a high level music theater program in the future, Indiana University must meet the guidelines of the National Standards. Indiana University had to have high expectations for students to reach. Students should study the knowledge of liberal arts. In addition, students had to complete the requirements of the degree of a Bachelor of Music.

Vision in Non-Music Fields

In non-music fields, several research studies have investigated the status of subjects' educational programs from subjects' viewpoints and have envisioned the relationship between current status and future vision. Will (2002) studied a vision of technology integration in the classroom curriculum. A case study method was designed (1) to understand how teachers integrated technology into the classroom curriculum to support their teaching, and (2) to document teachers' learning during and after they received technology training through an online (OL) or face-to-face (F2F) course. The teachers who received the technology training were elementary and secondary teachers. In the procedure of data collection and analysis, Shulman's complimentary data collection was used for analyzing the obstacles and benefits that affected teachers' integration of technology skill into the classroom curriculum at different school grades.

After analyzing the eight cases, the results showed that teachers did not add technology into their existing teaching methods. Instead, teachers used technology in different ways to support classroom practice. Moreover, the results indicated that intrinsic and extrinsic obstacles affected teachers' capability to integrate technology into their classroom curriculum. Other factors were also found that interfered with the instructors' teaching results. The appropriateness of instructors' instructional approaches affected the teachers' learning outcomes. The teachers' technological skill levels impacted the understanding of the instructors' technology language. A teacher's career goals and self-expectations influenced their desire to learn new knowledge. Teachers' learning styles, like constructivist-oriented teachers or learner-centered teachers, influenced the ways that teachers approached teaching. The findings provided information for instructors to train different types of teachers for gaining technology knowledge in the future.

To study the application of the reform's educational guidelines to future teaching systems, Friedlander (1997) investigated how a university dance department's certification-granting teacher program prepared students to be dance teachers based on the ten educational reform themes. A questionnaire was designed for seniors, alumni, and program coordinators from selected universities. The participants responded with their opinions about the national reform's influence on dance teacher certification programs. The open-ended questions were intended for the participants to express their individual opinions freely.

The results showed that some dance departments integrated the national reform into their programs more than others. The participants in this study did not fully understand the national reform. Compared to faculty and students, faculty members were more aware of the national reform than students. Dance department students had little knowledge on how to apply national reforms into elementary and secondary education settings. The results also found that there were few similarities among university dance departments' and K-12 schools' dance curricula in relation to the reform educational ten contemporary themes. The subjects said that in order to envision the reform of future dance education programs, the dance educators had to learn the ten educational reform themes in order to apply the themes to school educational systems.

Another approach of studying the vision of future programs can be seen in a study of educational leaders' viewpoints to envision their country's future educational system. Obeid (1998) studied the vision of the Palestinian future educational system. By interviewing leaders and educators in a new Palestinian self-ruled area and collecting historical and educational data, the researcher was able to develop a broad-based philosophical curriculum for a future educational system. The researcher interpreted interviewees' recorded conversations and analyzed the data with a critical hermeneutic theory and participatory research method.

The findings indicated that many complex factors were involved with the development of the Palestinian educational system. The respondents said that developing an educational system should satisfy the learners' cultural, social and spiritual needs because of their cultural and political environment. The educational system also had to honor the past and broaden the future. However, the results found that different concepts of religion, politics, and ideology among leaders made it difficult to envision the same future. In addition, the political conflicts with Israel and two separate geographical Palestinian self-ruled areas, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, were two other obstacles affecting the development of the future educational system.

A similar approach to study the vision of future programs from educational leaders' viewpoints was done by Holmes (1992). Holmes (1992) studied the vision of 21st century American schooling through interviews with 21 prominent individuals who participated in reforming the American school system. The 21 prominent individuals described their vision of the American school system in the 21st century and barriers that might be perceived. The 21 individuals were school leaders, professors, school administrators, union representatives, journalists, professional organization executives, corporate liaisons and private foundation representatives. The survey instrument used an open-ended, in-depth interview technique. A qualitative procedure was used to analyze the transcribing document using a constant comparative analysis of coded categories. The examination of documents was from different components: values and beliefs, curriculum and instruction, governance, culture, vision of a probable 21st century system of schooling, and barriers identified as preventing school reform.

To envision the idealized 21st century American schooling, the study described five themes that would have to be met: (1) a caring community of learners; (2) democracy in action; (3) conserving and developing human resources; (4) problem solving, and (5) flexibility. The

results also stated that few existing schools could be models for establishing the idealized 21st American school. The subjects said that the unmet student learning outcomes would continue if schools persisted in the current way. The five barriers that were pointed out that would affect establishing an idealized American schooling were: (1) lack of money; (2) old-fashion images; (3) educators themselves; (4) a lack of commitment to making an effort to change; and (5) not understanding the new processes. To succeed in the idealized 21st American schooling, these five barriers would have to be removed.

Conclusion

The topics of the studies in this review of literature have covered major areas in the piano pedagogy field, including historical, piano pedagogy curricula, technology, teacher training, instructors, conference proceedings, and group piano instruction. Most of these studies are older and in need of updated results. Also, for each topic area, the number of studies was very limited. The status studies pointed out the weaknesses and issues that have existed in the field, but very few recent studies have been done to determine if the status of programs has changed. In addition, few studies have investigated the vision of future music pedagogy programs from influential piano pedagogues' perspectives. Therefore, the results of reviewing the research studies have shown that a follow-up study is needed for the newest information on university piano pedagogy programs. Furthermore, in addition to the status of recent pedagogy programs, an investigation of the future of pedagogy is needed.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In this chapter, several sections have been included in terms of presenting the methodological procedures for this study. The sections include research method, subjects, measurement instrument, equipment, reliability and validity, data collection and data analysis. The purpose of this chapter is to present the processes and the approaches used to obtain the results of the study.

Research Method

The primary objective of this study was to interview a group of university piano pedagogy program leaders concerning (1) the existing status of their piano pedagogy program, and (2) their vision for the future direction of an ideal piano pedagogy program. In speaking to their vision of an ideal future pedagogy program, the leaders were asked to highlight possible obstacles that would need to be removed for an ideal program to exist.

Each leader represented 1 of the 20 universities offering a piano pedagogy program that was recommended by a group of piano pedagogues for this research study. An appropriate number of 20 subjects for a descriptive survey interview study was based on (1) Holmes' (1992) study on the vision of a 21st century American schooling system through an interview with 21 prominent individuals who participated in reforming the American school system, and (2) Willis' (2002) case study with 8 subjects on a vision of technology integration in the public school educational system. Because their procedures were similar to the current study, I decided to use a sample size of 20 which was within the scope of what these previous studies had chosen

for their sample sizes. To ascertain leaders' viewpoints regarding the status of existing and future university piano pedagogy programs in an efficient way, a survey research study using a telephone interview method was chosen for the study.

Subjects

Subjects were the leaders of the top 20 U. S. university piano pedagogy programs (see Appendix A for the 20 university names) that were recommended by a census group of 29 piano pedagogues who taught university piano pedagogy courses and participated in the National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum of 2002. Several procedures were considered prior to determining the subjects for the study. First, since I decided to interview the leaders of 20 universities offering piano pedagogy programs, finding the appropriate universities for interviewing the leaders of piano pedagogy programs for the study was essential. However, there was no updated published directory that listed all universities offering piano pedagogy programs or degrees at the undergraduate and graduate level. Therefore, I could not select universities randomly from a list. Since there was no updated list of universities offering piano pedagogy programs, I decided to ask people in the piano pedagogy field to recommend 20 universities offering piano pedagogy programs.

When I decided to invite people to recommend piano pedagogy programs, deciding the type of universities offering piano pedagogy programs for people to recommend was the challenge. To obtain an objective and comprehensive opinion of the existing status and future of piano pedagogy programs, a piano pedagogy program with a good reputation would be considered as a successful model for other schools to follow. Therefore, I decided to ask the piano pedagogues to recommend 20 universities with strong reputations in piano pedagogy.

After deciding the type of university that could be used for the purposes of this study, then the leaders of the 20 top recommended universities offering piano pedagogy programs could be used as the subjects for the study.

Once the leaders of the 20 top recommended universities offering piano pedagogy programs were targeted as the subjects, finding a group of appropriate people as the providers of the recommendations was the next procedure. In this case, I decided to invite university piano pedagogy instructors to recommend the information. I had to find piano pedagogy instructors who were active in the piano pedagogy field and had commensurate knowledge to recommend 20 universities offering excellent piano pedagogy programs. For the current study, the participants of a major national piano pedagogy conference served as the recommendation providers.

The National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum has held a piano pedagogy conference every other year starting in the year 2000. The primary mission of the National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum is to discuss the issues of university piano pedagogy programs. Traditionally, it has invited major piano professors who have taught university piano or piano pedagogy courses.

Fifty piano pedagogues were listed as participants of the National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum of 2002 on the Website of the National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum (see Appendix B for the participant names and university names). All of the participants were contacted to recommend 20 piano pedagogy programs. The website stated that the pedagogues were actively teaching in either universities or colleges. To confirm this information, at the beginning of the email to the participants, I asked for their teaching position

information. If they were not involved in college or university teaching, I excluded them from the recommendation provider's list.

After deciding to use the group of piano pedagogues as the recommendation providers, the pedagogues were contacted through email. The email addresses were obtained through each university's web-site or each music department's administrative assistant. The email letter (see Appendix C) to the pedagogues included (1) an introduction; (2) the purpose of the study; (3) the reason for the email; and (4) a list of institutions offering piano pedagogy programs from the 1991 Directory of Piano Pedagogy Offerings in American Colleges and Universities compiled by The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy Committee (*Proceedings of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy*, 1991, p. 186-210) (see Appendix D). I reminded the participants that this list was out of date and not complete. The purpose of providing the list was as a reference. The piano pedagogues could provide university names which were not on the list. The piano pedagogues were asked to recommend what they believed to be the top 20 universities offering piano pedagogy programs with strong reputations in piano pedagogy.

I asked the piano pedagogues to reply with the recommended university names in an email to me. Once I received the responses, I replied immediately to thank the pedagogues for their assistance. For those people who did not respond to the email, I sent a reminder email to encourage response after one week. One month later, 50 were sent and 29 responded. After collecting the list of universities which were recommended by the 29 piano pedagogues, the 20 universities with the highest rankings were chosen and the chairmen of the 20 piano pedagogy programs were designated as the subjects for this study.

The final step was to contact subjects for the main study. I contacted subjects through email first and then interviewed them over the telephone later. The process of choosing the type

of instrument for interviewing subjects and the detailed procedures for contacting and interviewing subjects will be discussed in the measurement instrument section.

Measurement Instrument

Several considerations were made in the process of choosing a research measurement instrument tool. Survey questionnaires, interviews and telephone interviews have been the three research methods that have commonly been used for descriptive survey studies (Dillman, 1978). A written survey questionnaire has some benefits over either a face-to-face interview or a telephone interview because the questionnaire costs less and subjects can complete the task at any convenient time. However, since this study was designed to ask respondents to express personal opinions and feelings, as Mouley (1978) stated, a survey questionnaire might have restricted the answers to more shallow responses. The design of a written survey questionnaire could not cover all of the potential questions and responses comprehensively.

Instead, Mouley (1978) advocated several advantages of using the interview technique as a research tool. For instance, it can help researchers stimulate the respondents to provide more in-depth answers. It can encourage respondents to share more personal feelings than respondents might be able to put in writing. It also can help to clarify any confusion in a conversation and help the respondents to provide more answers that align with a researcher's question.

Donald (1966) stated that telephone interviews not only can help an interviewer to re-question a non-response question which a mailing questionnaire cannot do, but also can help an interviewer obtain more in-depth answers, gain more accurate answers, control the interview sequence more successfully, and cost less than a face-to-face interview. In addition to these

benefits, the telephone interview can be completed at any convenient time depending upon the subjects' and the researcher's schedules.

Due to the fact that the investigated universities in this study were located in different regions, the researcher could not interview the subjects in person. Also, it would have been difficult and expensive to complete face-to-face interviews. Therefore, a telephone interview was utilized as the research method for this study.

According to Patton (1990), for a qualitative interview and interview questions, there are three standard types of qualitative interviews: (1) the informal conversational interview; (2) the general interview guide approach; and (3) the standard open-ended interview. Due to the circumstances of the telephone interview, the standard open-ended interview was considered to be best for the current study because the researcher could efficiently use the same interview questions and obtain the needed information in the limited time available. The data analysis could be easier and more systematic, and also increase credibility. The informal conversational interview has no standard interview questions for each subject and requires the interviewer and participants to interact in the environment spontaneously. The data gathered would be different across interviewed participants. A general interview guide can provide a general format for the interviewer to obtain more in-depth data depending on interviewees' circumstances. The general interview can take a long time to gather complete data, however, in a telephone interview with limited time, it can be easy to omit some important information. Therefore, I chose the standard open-ended interview as the type of measurement instrument.

All interview questions were in an open-ended format. Since the purpose of this study was to investigate the status and the vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy program from piano pedagogy program leaders' perspectives, an open-ended question allowed me to elicit

contextual and in-depth responses from the subjects and also allowed the subjects to express their opinions freely and imaginatively.

Once the type of measurement instrument had been chosen, then designing the interview questions was completed. To develop interview questions that covered the two research questions, I had to investigate research studies, articles and books with topics that were related to the purposes of this study in the music and non-music fields. The questions which were developed by research studies or suggested by articles and books were the starting place for the researcher's interview questions. The researcher also had to know the reasons why these interview questions in the reviewed literature were formed in order to successfully develop the interview questions of this study.

In addition, I did not only collect information from reviewed literature, but also studied information from university websites, catalogues, bulletins, and music magazines that related to universities, music schools, piano divisions and piano faculty, prior to interviewing the subjects. All of the related information became part of the data. Through the leaders' answers to the interview questions, I tried to ascertain the perceived status and vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy program from the perspective of selected piano pedagogy programs' leaders.

After reviewing the related studies, several interview questions were designed in relation to the first research question describing the status of the subjects' current pedagogy programs. The interview questions on status were developed from the reviewed literature including: instructors (Kowalchuk, 1989; Lancaster, 1979; Shook, 1993), funds (Lyman, 1991), intern teaching program (Lyman, 1991; MTNA, 1990; Wolfersberger, 1988), curriculum content (Mcarthur, 1992; Renfrow, 1991), degrees offered (Charoenwongse, 1999, Johnson, 2003; Milliman, 1992; Paganelli, 1981), and technology (Brubaker, 1997; Charoenwongse, 1999;

Johnson, 2003; Uszler, 1992). For the first research question, I developed nine interview questions, one concerning strength of the program, one concerning curriculum, one concerning teacher training, two concerning instructors, one concerning finances, one concerning technology, one concerning challenges, and one concerning improvement.

I. Research Question One: What is the current status of prominent piano pedagogy programs?

1. What do you think are the attributes that your program has that would make individuals recommend it as one of the top 20 piano pedagogy programs in the United States?
2. What are the subjects' educational backgrounds in the 20 prominent piano pedagogy programs? (web-based question)
3. Can you describe the curricular content of the pedagogy courses at your institution at both the undergraduate and graduate levels?
4. In terms of practical teacher training, can you describe how students get their hands-on experiences in your curriculum?
5. What type of degree do you think is best to have for those teaching piano pedagogy courses and why?
6. In terms of finances, how is the budget distributed in your program?
7. How is technology used in your program?
8. From the issues that we have discussed above, which one do you see as the largest challenge of your program and why?
9. If you could only improve one challenge at a time for your program, which issue would you be most anxious to improve immediately and why?

The second research question was what is the vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy program from the perspective of 20 piano pedagogy leaders? The interview questions were developed from Holmes' (1992) study concerning a vision of the 21st century American educational schooling system because the purpose of his study was similar to the purpose of the current study. Holmes investigated the probable 21st century American educational schooling system, an idealized 21st American educational school system, and the barriers that might occur in the establishment of the 21st century idealized American educational schooling system by interviewing 21 people who were involved in the reform of the American educational schooling system. For the second research question, I developed four interview questions, one concerning the vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy program, one concerning an ideal degree, one concerning the barriers that might occur in the establishment of an ideal future piano pedagogy program and one concerning solutions to the barriers that might occur.

II. Research Question Two: What is the vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy program from the perspective of 20 piano pedagogy leaders?

1. In your mind, if you were going to plan an ideal piano pedagogy program in the future, how would you envision this piano pedagogy program?
2. Some research studies have recommended providing separate degrees in piano pedagogy at both the undergraduate and graduate level. However, other studies have advocated combining performance and pedagogy degrees into one degree. In your ideal program, how would this debate be reflected in the piano pedagogy degree that you offered?
3. In your opinion, what are the possible obstacles that may occur in establishing an ideal piano pedagogy program?

4. Can you provide some possible solutions for the possible obstacles that may occur in establishing an ideal piano pedagogy program?

Equipment

Three pieces of equipment were used for recording the interviewed telephone conversations: a telephone, a multi-phone telephone recorder and a cassette recorder with CTR-111 cassette tapes. The telephone connected to the phone line. The telephone recorder had a 2.5 mm-to recorder remote (REM) jack, 3.5 mm-to recorder's microphone (MIC) jack, a record/play switch, and a wall jack. The cassette recorder had the functions of Record, Play, Rewind, Fast-forward, Stop/Eject, Pause, Record and Battery indicators. The cassette recorder also had the outputs of DC adapter jack, earphone jack, AUS input jack (REM) and remote-control microphone jack (MIC).

To install the equipment for recording the conversation, I had to unplug the Panasonic telephone from a wall jack and plug it into the phone jack on the back of the telephone recorder. Then I plugged the telephone recorder's phone plug into the wall jack. I inserted the small (2.5 mm) plug on the telephone recorder's Y-cable into the cassette recorder's REM jack and the large (3.5 mm) plug into the cassette recorder's MIC jack.

In an email to the 20 subjects, I notified the participants that the entire telephone conversation would be recorded and illustrated the reasons why the telephone conversation had to be recorded for documentation and analysis in the study. However, to protect subjects' privacy, all the personal information in the telephone conversation was kept confidential. Therefore, any part of a conversation used in the dissertation document itself remained anonymous.

Before the telephone interviewing began, I reminded subjects that the entire conversation would be recorded as the data of the study. Once the subjects agreed, I had to set the telephone recorder's Record/Play switch to Record and then set the cassette recorder to Record. As soon as the interviewing conversation started, the telephone recorder started to record. It stopped automatically after the telephone was hung up. I then pressed the Stop button on the cassette recorder. When I was ready to listen to the recorded conversation, I set the Record/Play switch to Play, rewinded the tape in the cassette recorder, and then pressed the cassette recorder's Play button. When I finished listening and preparing for the next recording, I set the Record/Play switch to Record again.

Data Collection

Before the telephone interview, an email letter (see Appendix E) was sent to the leaders (1) introducing the purpose of the study; (2) describing how they were chosen as a subject for the study; (3) presenting the questions that would be discussed during the telephone interview; and (4) asking an appropriate time to call for completion of a telephone interview.

The procedure of presenting the interview questions to subjects before interviewing has been shown to increase the probability of successful completion and efficiency of an interview (Slocum, Empey, & Swanson, 1967). The subjects were also able to consider their responses to the questions before the telephone interview. This technique was advocated by Patton (1990) who called the procedure of presenting the interview questions to subjects before the actual interview a "prefatory statement" (p. 321). He advocated that prefatory statements help the subject to know what is going to be asked prior to the actual interview. Subjects can be aware

of, organize, and focus on the interview questions. The prefatory statement can reduce roughness and silences during an interview.

After emailing the 20 subjects and presenting them with the interview questions, a reminder email was sent one week later to the subjects who hadn't responded to me, reminding them of the research study. I emphasized the importance and benefits of the study. Once subjects replied to the email and provided an appropriate time for a telephone interview, the subjects were then each contacted at the scheduled time.

To obtain a successful telephone interview, Brandt (1972) advocated that the conversation in a telephone interview should be conducted in an open, supportive, reflective way that encourages respondents to converse. Subjects could answer the questions in any order that they wished since the subjects knew of the questions prior to the interview. In Holmes' (1992) study on a vision of the 21st century American school system, he considered that the order of questions depended on subject choice which also helped the conversation to flow naturally and smoothly. If the subject had any other related topics which they chose to address, the topics would become a part of the conversation.

In addition, Holmes (1992) warned that, due to the limitations of a telephone interview where no facial or body motion can be seen, the researcher has to judge the respondents' reactions based on paralinguistic cues, for instance, intonation and pauses, as an indication of respondents' attitude and feelings. If the subject dragged the tone for a few second "what?...or "what do you mean...?" the researcher would repeat the question again. If the subject paused for a few seconds "m...m...", the researcher would ask the subject if he/or she understood the question or if there was any confusion that the researcher could help to clarify.

Patton (1990) also advocated that reinforcement and feedback by the researcher permits the researcher to fulfill the knowledge that is desired and provide a sign to subjects that a certain question is going to end. Hence, I concluded the conversation at the end of each question to make sure the conversation was understood correctly. Patton also suggested that reinforcement and feedback can make subjects feel that the time spent in an interview was worthy. Hence, I thanked the subjects for their opinions once individual question were completed.

Data Analysis

Once each interview had been completed, the data analysis began. The first procedure was to transcribe the telephone conversations and check the accuracy of the transcript. I transcribed the conversation of each telephone interview. To make sure that every word was transcribed carefully, I replayed the tape repeatedly. After transcribing each conversation, I played the tape and checked the entire transcript twice to ensure the transcript was accurate.

After transcribing each conversation, a summarization of each subject's conversation took place. In addition to transcribing individual subjects' information, a constant comparative method was also utilized for the analysis of this study. A constant comparative method can be described as a constant search for patterns, similarities and differences among the data (Glaser, 1978, Holmes, 1992). Once one transcript and summary were completed, I compared the data with previous ones. I compared the similarities and differences among the subjects and presented the uniqueness of each university and their leader's viewpoints.

After completing the transcription of each individual case and comparison of multi-cases, I used the technique of analyst triangulation to enhance the credibility of data analysis (Patton, 1990). Analyst triangulation means using multiple analysts to check the research outcomes. The

benefits of this technique have also been advocated by Lincoln and Guba (1985) who stated that confirmability helps the researcher to interpret more objectively, rather than subjectively.

Bresler and Stake (1996) also claimed that in analyzing qualitative research, it is difficult to be accurate the first time information is received and the meaning of messages that people receive may vary from person to person. Therefore, the researcher needed to have others check the documents for accuracy.

First, the information providers helped the researcher to confirm the documents. I presented each transcript to each individual subject for final approval over email. After subjects had read the documents transcribed by me, the subjects replied with their opinions to me. Any different findings than the subjects meant to express were changed.

Second, two language specialists who worked for the language department at the University of North Texas were hired as data analysts in the study. This process involved each language specialists to randomly choose 10 recorded tapes and transcripts to listen and check for accuracy. The language specialists also checked the results that I obtained and gave their own opinions to me. If there was any information which was not accurate or should have been included, I fixed the documents. Finally, after the language specialists approved the documents, the results of the interview were finalized.

Validity and Reliability

Originally, 16 interview questions were developed from the related literature before checking the validity of the instrument.

I. Research Question One: What is the current status of 20 prominent piano pedagogy programs?

1. In your opinion, what are the strengths of your program? Can you envision the reason why your program was recommended as one of the top 20 piano pedagogy programs in the United States?
2. How many credit hours are required for undergraduate and graduate students?
3. Do you offer beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels of pedagogy courses differently for undergraduate and graduate levels? If yes, what is the main focus on each level? If no, can you describe how you arrange curriculum content?
4. In terms of hands-on teacher training, does your curriculum content provide instructions from the beginning to advanced levels?
5. How many piano pedagogy instructors does your program have? How many of them are hired as full-time positions or half-time positions? What are their earned degrees?
6. In terms of finances, in your opinion, what do you think the financial status of your program is now? From where does the major funding come? For what is the funding primarily used?
7. Can you describe the use of facilities, such as labs, computers, software programs, and electronic piano for training pedagogy students?
8. Many research studies have recommended that piano pedagogy programs should offer technological knowledge (ex: the use of computer software program systems, synthesizers, electronic piano, or the knowledge of on-line resources) for helping pedagogy students to utilize these areas along with their teaching in the future. In your opinion, how do you see this technological knowledge as applying to your curriculum content?

9. In terms of challenges to your program, in your opinion, are there any related to:
(a) pedagogy instructors; (b) funding; (c) the intern teaching program; (d) curriculum content; and (e) the use of facilities. Or is your program facing any other challenges?
 10. If you could only improve one challenge at a time for your program, which one would you be most anxious to improve immediately? Please describe the reason.
- (II) Research Question Two: What is the vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy program from the perspective of 20 piano pedagogy leaders?
11. What do you think a future direction of your piano pedagogy will be in terms of curriculum content, instructors, finances and facilities?
 12. In your mind, if you were going to build an ideal piano pedagogy program for the future, could you envision the type of piano pedagogy program that this would be.
 13. Some research studies have recommended providing separate degrees in piano pedagogy at both the undergraduate and graduate level. However, other studies have advocated combining performance and pedagogy degrees into one degree. In your opinion, what is the best option for piano students and why?
 14. What types of degrees will you offer in your ideal piano pedagogy program?
 15. In your opinion, what are the possible obstacles that may occur in establishing an ideal future piano pedagogy program?
 16. Can you provide some possible solutions for the possible obstacles that may occur in establishing an ideal piano pedagogy program?

To check the validity of the measurement instrument, I invited a panel of experts to help me to see if the interview questions could successfully represent the purposes of the study. The panel of experts included one female holding a DMA degree in piano performance with an emphasis in piano pedagogy, one male holding a Ph.D. degree in music education, and one male holding a masters degree in piano performance who was teaching piano pedagogy courses at a university. The reason for choosing these individuals as a panel of experts was because they received collegiate piano pedagogy training and were involved in college piano teaching. They had knowledge of the piano pedagogy field and were interested in the development of piano pedagogy programs.

I presented the purposes of the study and the 16 original interview questions to the panel of experts. Then, I described how the 16 original interview questions had been developed and what kind of information that I desired to obtain from each interview question. For checking validity of the 16 original interview questions, I developed a content validity sheet to ask the panel of experts if these individual interview questions could serve the function that I intended. The content validity sheet contained seven questions:

1. In terms of the purpose of my study, do you think the design of the interview question is comfortably, clearly and appropriately addressed?
2. Is the length of my interview too short, too long, or just right?
3. Do you think that the Part I interview questions can accurately collect information on the status of piano pedagogy programs?
4. For the Part I interview questions, do you see any confusing, similar or double meaning questions?
5. Do you think that the Part II interview questions can accurately collect information on leaders' vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy program?

6. For the Part II interview questions, do you see any confusing, similar, or double meaning questions?
7. Can you think about any other interview questions that I inadvertently left out related to my study?

Due to the different interpretations of individual questions, I had to reword phrases or delete unnecessary questions once I noticed that individuals interpreted the questions differently, or some questions had similar meanings that could be combined into one question. From the suggestions of the panel of experts, several corrections had to be made. The questions numbered one and six, contained more than one question and were too long. Therefore, I changed question number one to “what do you think are the attributes that your program has that would make individuals recommend it as one of the top 20 piano pedagogy programs in the United States?” Question number six was changed to “in terms of finances, how is the budget distributed in your program?” Questions two and three were not open-ended and the information did not necessarily serve the purpose of this study. I decided to delete the questions. The information for question five could be obtained through the web-site prior to the interview. I decided to gather the data through online funds was confusing to information to add to the descriptive information of the study.

The design of question number four regarding teacher training and number six regarding the experts, and therefore, I rephrased the questions to “in terms of practical teacher training, can you describe how students get their hands-on experiences in your curriculum?”, “can you describe the internship program in your curriculum?” and “in terms of finances, how is the budget distributed in your program?”

Several questions had similar meanings, including question number seven and eight regarding technology, 11 and 12 regarding an ideal program, and 15 and 16 regarding future degrees. Hence, I combined them into three synthesized questions. The new synthesized questions were “how is technology used in your program?”, “in your mind, if you were going to plan an ideal piano pedagogy program in the future, how would you envision this piano pedagogy program?” and “some research studies have recommended providing separate degrees in piano pedagogy at both the undergraduate and graduate level. However, other studies have advocated combining performance and pedagogy degrees into one degree. In your ideal program, how would this debate be reflected in the piano pedagogy degree that you offered?”

Unclear, interview questions were rephrased to obtain more comprehensive information. For question number five, which investigated opinions about pedagogy instructors, the panel of experts suggested asking the question “can you describe the qualifications of your piano pedagogy instructors? For challenges that existed in piano pedagogy programs, question number nine was changed to “which one do you see as the largest challenge of your program?” After applying the feedback of the panel of experts, the two major research questions contained a total of 14 interview questions.

After finalizing the interview questions with an appropriate validity check, the reliability check began. Three people were used for a pilot test, including one retired chairman of a piano pedagogy program who held a DMA degree in piano performance, one is chairman of a university piano pedagogy program who was a Ph.D. candidate in music education with a piano pedagogy emphasis, and one who held a DMA degree, currently teaching class piano in the piano division at a university. The reason for choosing these individuals as pilot test participants

was because of their experiences of being leaders in college piano pedagogy programs, university teaching experiences and knowledge about piano pedagogy programs.

First, I introduced the study and the purpose of the pilot study. Once they agreed to participate in the pilot study, I presented the interview questions to the three people and interviewed them. The length of the interview was 75, 30 and 45 minutes respectively.

During the pilot test, recordings were made of the responses to the interview questions. After finishing the interview, I asked participants if the interview questions appropriately addressed the purpose of the study. One participant considered that question three “In terms of practical teacher training, can you describe how students get their hands-on experiences in your curriculum?” had similar meaning as question four “can you describe the intern program in your curriculum?” In addition, both participants agreed that the information on question five “can you describe the qualification of your piano pedagogy instructors” could be obtained through the web-site. It was not necessary to ask during the interview. Therefore, I decided to synthesize question three and four into one question “in terms of practical teacher training, can you describe how students get their hands-on experiences in your curriculum?” and the deleted question five. As a result, 13 final interview questions were developed for two research questions for the purpose of this study. I transcribed the interview conversations verbatim and summarized the data. I not only transcribed their words, but also presented transcript markings (Schegloff, Sacks, & Jefferson, 1977) (see appendix H) including the accents, pauses, tones, moods, and the lengths of silences of each individual’s expressions during the interview. One week after their interview, I presented the transcripts to the individuals for their review. They checked if words were accurately transcribed and accents, pauses, tones, moods and the lengths of silences during the interview appropriately presented their feelings.

A member check was done with the first participant three weeks after she received the researcher's transcript. Several changes were made mainly due to the grammar mistakes. Beyond the grammar mistakes, the interview content was approved by the participant. The second participant replied to the researcher five weeks after she received the transcript due to summer break. After reviewing the transcript, the following changes were made. The music preparatory faculty was change to Music Pre faculty. The beginning level course and intermediate level course were changed to Beginning Piano Pedagogy and Intermediate Piano Pedagogy. The advanced level course for group piano was changed to Advanced Group Piano Pedagogy. The leaders' university names were changed to (my institution). Besides the term changes, the interview content was approved by the participant. In order to gain more practice in avoiding leading responses and encouraging follow up, a third interview was scheduled.

Because the third leader had not participated in a piano pedagogy program for the last 10 years, he only answered the second research question (interview questions one through four) about his vision for an ideal program, obstacles, possible solutions and an ideal degree. The member check was approved three weeks after the interview.

Results for the Pilot Test Participants

The eight categories of “strength, curriculum, teacher training, instructors, finance, technology, challenge, and improvement” were used to answer the first research question “ what is the status of 20 prominent piano pedagogy program?” The four categories of “ an ideal program, an ideal degree, obstacles, and possible solution were used to answer the second research question, “ what is the vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy program from the perspective of 20 piano pedagogy leaders? I initially analyzed the interview content of two

leaders as the pilot test participants. In order to gain more practice in avoiding leading responses and encouraging follow up, a third interview was scheduled after I interviewed the first and second pilot test participants. Because the third leader had not participated in a piano pedagogy program for last 10 years, he only answered interview questions one through four of the second research question about his vision for an ideal program, obstacles, possible solutions and an ideal degree.

Strength

There were only two leaders who responded to the entire 14 interview questions. The interview questions one through nine were only answered by the first two leaders. Through their responses, it revealed the similar characteristics as far as the leaders' viewpoints concerning the strengths of their programs. The common general characteristics were that the two programs had strong faculty members and offered diverse teacher training. The differences were in the specific strengths that the two leaders emphasized. In one program, the leader emphasized that their faculty members were consistently open to many new ideas and the faculty always provided ideas to make the program stronger. In addition, the curriculum offered sufficient hands-on teaching in different settings, like one-on-one and class piano for different age groups through the pedagogy courses. In the other program, the leader emphasized that the greatest strength of her program was that the faculty members' international reputations attracted students from all over the world. Furthermore, students received diverse teacher training through a huge preparatory program, which allowed students to gain experience through observation and teaching.

Curriculum

At the undergraduate level, both programs offered two levels of pedagogy courses. The commonalities in their curricular content were the preparations for building up a new piano studio, different methods and repertoire for teaching beginning students, the use of technology, teacher training and observation. The differences between the two programs were that one program offered a one year sequence of pedagogy courses and focused on teaching technique in the second semester, while the other program offered a two year sequence of pedagogy courses and expanded the curriculum content to preschool students, adults, the introduction of class piano, and a practicum in the second year.

At the graduate level, both programs offered advanced piano pedagogy courses including research techniques, an intern program and a graduation recital. The difference in the programs was the content that the two programs provided for students in their curricula. One program primarily dealt with thesis topics and career preparation, while the other program emphasized reviewing all types of piano repertoire.

Teacher Training

Both leaders' programs had similar procedures to provide students with teaching experiences. At the undergraduate level, students gained teaching experiences through teaching and observing with supervision in the pedagogy classes. In the first semester, students studied pedagogy knowledge. In the second semester, students started to teach in a one-on-one setting in front of the pedagogy class and supervised by an instructor. As a result, pedagogy students learned how to be piano teachers by teaching, observing, discussing and being supervised.

Also, at the graduate level, both programs' students received teacher training by being a faculty member in the preparatory division. The graduate students had opportunities to teach in the varied settings, like one-on-one, class piano for pre-school children and also for adults with faculty supervised. In addition, both leaders provided supervision to the students who had jobs off campus. The teachers would review their teaching by visiting their sessions or watching video tapes.

Instructors

The two leaders suggested that having a good playing ability was the first step of being a good pedagogy instructor, although their backgrounds were different. One program's leader earned a DMA degree, the other leader earned a masters degree in pedagogy and was working on a Ph.D. in music education with a piano pedagogy emphasis. In spite of their different backgrounds, they both believed that a qualified pedagogy instructor should receive a pedagogy degree at the graduate level.

Finance

In both programs, the preparatory departments financed the pedagogy departments. The relationship between the pedagogy and preparatory departments was strong. In both programs, money was generated by teaching assistants who taught in the preparatory programs as music preparatory faculty. These teaching assistants were paid partly from student tuition. The remaining money became the budget for the preparatory and pedagogy departments. Both leaders emphasized the importance of the relationship with the preparatory department. Not only did the pedagogy students gain a variety of teaching experiences by being music preparatory

faculty, but the students also helped the pedagogy and preparatory departments to earn money. While both preparatory programs helped the departments financially, the two leaders had different opinions on the extent of the financial help that the preparatory program provided. One leader felt that having a dynamic preparatory program would resolve financial issues quickly, but the other leader felt that she had little control over the program's finances because much of money was dependent on donations from the community.

Technology

Both leaders felt that technology was an important component of any pedagogy curriculum. In both programs, electronic equipment was available for pedagogy students, but to differing extents. The different technology that the two leaders emphasized in their programs might have been due to the leaders' training backgrounds. One leader, who had a DMA, had less knowledge of technology, and therefore, the electronic piano was the only technological equipment that she mentioned in the interview. To resolve her limitation, she suggested hiring special instructors who had technology training to teach pedagogy students. Although technology was not her strength, she still believed that teaching technological knowledge could not only enhance pedagogy students' abilities but also prepare students for better opportunities in their future careers. The other leader, who was working on a Ph.D. with a piano pedagogy emphasis, offered diverse technological knowledge for pedagogy students. She described how pedagogy students learned to utilize different equipment by observing both preparatory department's classes and their own pedagogy classes. She emphasized that using computer systems could help young students' knowledge on playing and theory.

Largest Challenge to Programs

Both leaders felt that they were facing multiple challenges. However, they had different views and priorities while handling them. One leader stated that the biggest challenge that she faced in her program was to offer business training within the curriculum content. She stated that pedagogy programs tended to ignore the business aspects when teaching students. They did not know how to handle tax, how to start a studio, how to plan for a retirement program, or how to enroll in an insurance program as self-employee workers once they started to teach. The other leader felt that the biggest challenge in her program was to fight with the piano performance division for recruitment. Because the faculty members in the piano performance division were known globally, normally, the top new incoming students chose to major in piano performance. If they could not be accepted as a performance major, then the new students chose to be a piano pedagogy major as a secondary option. She hoped that in the future, a new faculty, well-known in performance field and also having a pedagogy training background, could join her program to attract the more top piano students.

Improvement

As the leaders discussed the challenges that they were most anxious to improve, they both agreed that it was difficult and time consuming in reality although they had different subjects and orders that they wished to resolve. One leader wished to offer business training in her curriculum or allow pedagogy students to take courses from the business department as required credits. The other leader wished to provide sufficient faculty members for adequate supervision. She stated that it was very time consuming for one instructor to supervise all the pedagogy students. Hence, each pedagogy student could only receive a few supervisions during

a semester. If she could have team members supervise different students through a semester, students could have more knowledge on how to handle different teaching situations.

Ideal Program

All three leaders answered questions about an ideal program, obstacles, possible solutions, and an ideal degree. Under the category of the ideal program, the three leaders shared several similar viewpoints. They all agreed that the goal of an ideal program was to prepare students for their future careers. Therefore, an ideal program should have sufficient resources and diverse curriculum content. They all mentioned the necessity of the traditional pedagogical coursework like piano methods, teacher training at all levels and all age groups with supervision and practicum in the curriculum. But, in building up their ideal programs, the leaders had different angles and viewpoints.

One leader described that in her ideal program, the curriculum would focus more on performance and pedagogy areas than other subjects. Like a performance major, students would have to perform recitals as juniors and seniors. In addition, students would also take the intermediate level pedagogy courses as a pedagogy major. As a result, other subjects would be minimized and offered only at the beginning level. One leader wished that there were plenty of pedagogy major students and sufficient faculty members with specific areas of specializations. Because students' tuition could enhance the program's finances, the number of specialized faculty members in different areas could equip students with different strengths and prepare them for future careers.

One leader described how he dreamed that his ideal program would balance traditional and creative thoughts. He believed that an ideal program should maintain the traditional

coursework, teach students about being creative, offer observation and supervision within field experiences, provide up-to-date technology, and equip a library with diverse resources for students' research. In addition, the ideal program should be united with faculty members who were from the music education division, pedagogy division, and performance division all working together to provide students with diverse knowledge. Furthermore, he described the goals for each degree in his ideal program. He considered that at the undergraduate level, the goal was to build up a solid and fundamental pedagogical knowledge. At the graduate level, it should be more intellectual. At the doctoral level, it should develop a student's own style and put the personal style into writing, research, publication and teaching.

Ideal Degree

One consensus that appeared among the three leaders was their answer to the ideal program, which they described as a combined degree for piano performance and pedagogy. They all believed that piano students should have a solid foundation in performance as the first step and then gradually receive pedagogy training along with course work at the undergraduate level. A combined degree would provide all the benefits from performance and pedagogy equally.

When I asked for reasons that they desired the combined degree, the leaders had different angles from which to view it. One leader recommended this combined degree for the undergraduate students because it would prepare them with more opportunities for various living environments and career options if some students had no desire to go on to graduate studies. To accomplish this degree, students would give recitals in their junior and senior years as a performance major, and also take two year sequences of courses as pedagogy majors. As a

result, other courses like composition, advanced orchestration and counterpoint would be limited to only the beginning level.

One leader felt that a combined degree could erase the leveling and make the announcement that they believed that performance and pedagogy were equally important. Because in her program, the top students chose to be performance majors and other students chose a pedagogy major as a secondary option, she wished that the performance and pedagogy divisions could work together for the same benefits instead of fighting for the top students.

One leader proposed three different steps for an ideal degree. In his view, he suggested a performance degree with a certificate in piano pedagogy for the bachelor's, a combined degree for piano performance and pedagogy for the masters, and a Ph.D. degree with a secondary field for the doctorate. He felt that the three different types of degrees with different emphases at the different stages of study would be the best scenario for a person pursuing a career as a piano teacher. He stated that a performance degree could provide students with sufficient performance training at the earlier stages and a certificate in piano pedagogy could help students who were also interested in piano pedagogy. However, at the masters level, the proportion of piano playing should be narrowed down and the pedagogy training should be increased, he felt, hence, a combined degree would be the best scenario. For the doctoral degree, he did not consider that a DMA degree was the best choice; instead, a Ph.D. degree would be most appropriate.

Possible Obstacles to Obtaining Ideal Programs

In terms of obstacles in establishing an ideal program, the three leaders all mentioned that money and limited space were issues that they would face. They all agreed that money has always been an issue and it has not been able to improve. Right now, they felt that money was

too short for expanding facilities, spaces, and hiring faculty. The limited space made it difficult for pedagogy students to practice teaching in different settings. They believed that once the financial situation improved, the limited spaces and other obstacles could be overcome much more easily.

Two leaders among the three also talked about the students' attitudes to the pedagogy program. They felt that piano students did not evaluate pedagogy as being as honorable as performance. They stated that most of the time students chose a pedagogy major as a secondary option once they could not be accepted as a performance major. As a result, this makes a pedagogy program even more difficult to develop.

Beyond finances, spaces, and attitude, one leader also talked about other obstacles that he visualized, which were faculty, facilities, general sense of value, management of a library, committed students, travel capabilities, time constraints, and student attitude. He felt that because of the obstacles that exist in the current pedagogy program, those were the obstacles that kept a pedagogy program unable to attract top piano students to choose this field as their first priority.

Possible Solutions to Ideal Programs

Although the three leaders shared some similar obstacles in their minds, the solutions to the obstacles that they provided were different. One leader suggested that a quick way to build a strong and dynamic preparatory program was to enhance the financial situation. Once the financial situation improved, then spaces would be able to expand. One leader felt like she had no solution for the obstacles. Because the funding mainly depended upon fund raising and fund

raising was not in her control. The only way was to learn to compromise and strive for excellence.

One leader suggested several possible solutions to resolve the obstacles that included more partnering of piano pedagogy, financial grants which were directly dedicated to the pedagogy program, and scholarships which were primarily for pedagogy students. However, even with these suggestions, he believed that the major approach to solve the issues depended upon leaders' personalities and abilities. He believed that each leader would come up with his own solution based on his personality and strengths.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Once the main study began, I emailed the piano pedagogy instructors who were the participants of the 2002 National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum (GP3), asking them to vote for the 20 university piano pedagogy programs that they believed had the best reputations. Due to the limitations of web searching, I could not find the e-mail addresses of five participants. Therefore, a total of 46 participants were contacted by e-mail to recommend their top 20 lists. One week later, a reminder email was sent to encourage response. Over the next three weeks, 23 responses containing top 20 lists were emailed to me. On the fourth week, I went to the 2006 MTNA Convention in Austin to meet participants and encourage more response. By the fifth week, six more participants had responded to me. In total, 29 people provided a list for the top 20 university piano pedagogy programs.

From the schools recommended by the 63% that responded (29 out of 46 recommenders), I compiled a list of the top 20 schools with the highest ranking as the research targets. I contacted the top 20 university piano pedagogy programs' leaders to gather data for the purposes of the study. Nineteen out of 20 leaders responded to me to schedule a telephone interview. Due to the non-responses of one leader, I added one more university to the list of top 20 universities. As a result, there were 21 universities marked as the top 20 universities. These were (in alphabetical order) Arizona State University, Bowling Green State University, Capital University, Cincinnati Conservatory of Music, University of Colorado at Boulder, Florida State University, University of Illinois, Louisiana State University, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of North Texas, Northwestern University, Ohio University, Ohio State University, University of Oklahoma, University of South Carolina, Southern Methodist

University, University of Texas at Austin, Texas Christian University, Westminster Choir College, and Wichita State University. Due to the length of the individual interview content, the complete interview transcripts were placed as appendixes (Appendixes I). Each of the subjects was assigned a letter between A and T, by which they would be referenced throughout the study.

In this chapter, I compared the similarities and unique characteristics of the 20 subjects' interviews, dividing the content into 13 categories (12 interview questions and 1 web search question). The first 9 categories of 1) strength, 2) subjects' educational backgrounds, 3) curriculum, 4) teacher training, 5) instructors' qualifications, 6) finance, 7) technology, 8) challenge, and 9) improvement were used to answer the first research question, "What is the status of 20 prominent piano pedagogy programs?" The four categories of 1) an ideal program, 2) ideal degrees, 3) possible obstacles, and 4) possible solutions, were used to answer the second research question, "What is the vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy program from the perspective of 20 piano pedagogy leaders?"

To help readers understand the interaction between the researcher and the subject during the conversation, I used Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks's (1977) transcript markings to further clarify the context of the discussions. The following markings used for all quotations: "/" interruption of current speak by next speaker; "[" speakers begin simultaneously; "= " latching, no interval between the end of a prior piece and start of a next piece of talk; "(N.n)" elapsed time without talk, in tenth of seconds; "(.)" micropause (less than 5 seconds); "(hhh)" audible breathing; "- " a 'cut-off' of a prior word or sound; ":::" a drawing out of sound; text was written as heard, not according to grammatical convention; punctuation makers were used as phrasing and intonation, not according to grammatical convention; stressed words and word portions were italicized.

Strengths

At the beginning of every interview, I asked the 20 subjects to consider what strengths would have made the voters consider their program to be one of the 20 best in the country. The respondents came up with a variety of explanations. Some were modest or surprised at being chosen (n=4), while others were confident in the ways in which their programs were succeeding (n=16). Some factors that the subjects considered as contributing to their selection included faculty (n=20), history (n=7), teacher training (n=10), students (n=5), specialization (n=1), facilities (n=1), and group programs (n=1).

Unanimously, the subjects reported that strong faculty members were one of the leading characteristics that others would recognize as a strength of their programs. All 20 subjects mentioned faculty as a strength. As one explanation for why the pedagogy faculty was so strong, Subject I explained how strong faculty could influence voting. The subject stated, “I think *any* program is in part revered because of the *faculty* in the program, and our program always has had an excellent faculty... Truly, there is a tradition of having *excellent, visible* faculty.” Seven respondents, Subjects A, G, I, K, M, R, and T, attributed their selection to the visibility of their faculty in conferences or published articles. Subject A stated:

My personal (.) *visibility* in the field, the fact that I’m on the executive board of GP3, (.) I’m the head of the adult learning committee for the national conference in keyboard pedagogy, and I do a lot of *things* for MTNA. So my visibility, and giving *presentations*, oh, and the *Keyboard Companion*. So, I think my visibility helps somewhat.

Mentioning the same elements for recognition, Subject G explained:

I have *brought* visibility to our program through my *activities* in MTNA and the Keyboard Pedagogy Conference. (N.n.) I’ve been attending those sessions for a *long* time, and you know, *presented* at the national level, and I’ve also *published* articles that I think people have noticed.

Others found different ways that faculty could have contributed to their selection among the top 20 schools. Subjects B, D, I, J, L, and T attributed the results to equal strengths within both performance and pedagogy faculty. Subject B stated:

With *so many* pedagogy programs, there's maybe a very outstanding piano pedagogy person *there*, or they have a strong piano pedagogy tradition, but then when you *really* investigate the piano faculty that your students will be studying with, it's *not* as outstanding, as other schools. I mean, it can go the other way. And the piano faculty is just *wonderful* but the piano *pedagogy* area is not as strong. So I think it's very *unusual* when you can find a school that both areas are equally, really, *really* strong. And we are really strong in *both*.

Similarly, 6 respondents, Subjects C, D, I, J, K, and M, felt that strong professors from the program's past helped make the school visible. Subject M said, "As far as having a *reputation* such as that, of course, I think part of that, well, was from my *predecessors*, who came before me and some who are still here, (.) so I think some of the things that they developed and some of the things I've *added* may contribute to that." Subject I, going into specific details, explained how "a tradition of having *excellent* faculty" was an important factor in strengthening the program.

Similarly, 6 respondents felt that their programs were stronger because of the beneficial cooperation between the performance and pedagogy faculties. These programs were represented by Subjects F, H, J, P, Q, and S. Subject P explained:

I would tell prospective students that we are fortunate to not only *have* a very strong faculty, but the faculty also get *along* very well her. Even students who come to study pedagogy are *always* still interested in studying applied piano, that's always really important to them. (.) The applied teachers get along well, the piano pedagogy teachers are very well integrated into the whole piano faculty. (.) For instance... I just do piano pedagogy, but I go to *all* the recitals, I go to *all* our piano labs....many of our applied piano faculty will come to our piano pedagogy events. We get along very well, and there's a lot of *integration* within the program. There's no *infighting* between studios, I think that produces a healthy environment for students to work in.

Explaining the harmony at Subject F's institution, the respondent said:

There's also a *fairly* happy collaboration... between the piano *pedagogy* program and its faculty and the piano *performance* program and *its* faculty. You know in a lot of

institutions they kind of *fight* with one another, or the piano pedagogy may be treated as *second* class, and it's not that way here. (.) The piano faculty *appreciates* the fact that the pedagogy program is bringing in many of the best performance students as well. Two subjects, N, and O, felt that the faculty was strong largely because of the number of faculty members on staff. Subject N stated that "it has to do with the fact that we have two *full* time pedagogy faculty, (.) and many colleges and universities just have one person, you know, trying to run the whole program, but we have two full time pedagogy faculty with very *diverse* backgrounds, and I think that's a real *strength* to our program, that our students can see that kind of *diversity*."

Half of the subjects felt that they were chosen because of their strong teacher training programs. Subjects E, F, H, J, L, M, O, Q, S, and T felt that their pedagogy programs were selected as among the top 20 because of their students' opportunities to experience hands on teaching. Subject L, for instance, suggested that preparatory programs made the difference. The subject said that pedagogy was strong:

Because we have a huge preparatory program that provides pedagogy students the opportunity to teach at all levels from early childhood music to university college class piano. They gain teaching experiences that they probably did not have before coming to our program... private and also class piano... As part of the preparatory program, we have a very large early child music program from birth to six years of age.

Subject M explained the importance of this kind of program by saying:

If we're talking just for the pedagogy students, would be the opportunities to *teach*, or the *teacher training* aspect of the program, the *prep* program. (.) And so the students having *opportunities* and supervision of their teaching, because a lot of the undergraduates, (.) for example, it's their *first* time to teach a student, ever, and the same for some of the graduate students as well. So I think having that hands on experience, perhaps, is something that is *attractive* for them.

Another way that teacher training can aid a program was suggested by Subject O, who attributed training strengths to the internship and assistantship opportunities afforded to students.

The subject stated:

Students have the opportunity to select *internships* with different teachers. Here again, they can choose from as *many* as, well, I think we've had at least *10* different teachers involved, depending on the student's area of *interest*, so we want students to *graduate* having had a chance to sample many different *specialties*. (N.n) So to give you an idea of the range, I have a studio of private students of very *gifted* kids, who do lots of

competitions and auditions... so I've had many students who *elect* that for one of their internships. Another colleague... she has a private studio of *adult* students, so students can select that as an internship. There are others who select *group* piano as an internship so they can get more *group* experience. We've had people work with somebody just dealing with the *psychology* of music, preschool music, a traditional school, so that whatever they want to do, oh , some students have worked with *college* students, so that their internships are very *personalized*... Some of them even *split* their internship hours... The best part is that students have the opportunity to *explore* the areas that they think are important.

One subject recommended large group classes as an example of the program's strengths.

Subject E said, "We have *four* semesters of course work. As well as two semesters available for *student teaching*... Being a *large* school, we have a very large group piano program from which to use in terms of laboratory teaching and observation." Others (n=5) felt that the amount of supervision was the strongest aspect of their teacher training programs. For instance, Subject F explained, "Masters level students who enter this program get *more* actual teaching experience with a whole *variety* of student populations, and (.) it's teaching experience under *relatively* close supervision of the faculty, so there's a *constant* atmosphere of exchange and feedback."

Another respondent, Subject J, felt that variety was the strongest component and stated:

We have an incredible variety of *student teaching* experiences for our piano pedagogy students, so that, whether it's because of the university or the community we *live* in, they are able to student teach and be *supervised* in working kindermusic programs with very young children, typical age beginners, group piano for children, studio classes for high school students, advanced students, and class piano. They *gain* experience. We have *all* of these experiences available for our piano pedagogy students, and I think people know that and that is an area of strength.

Finally, one subject discussed special characteristics of teacher training programs. Subject H said:

I think our university has a lot of *collaborative* work that goes along, we have a wonderful *music* education professor... who is an early childhood specialist. So we collaborate a *lot* with her and many of our students... The students obtain teacher training and certification... And collaborative teaching opportunities between different *departments* within the school of music, and then also our *specialization*, or my

specialization I guess, as a pedagogy faculty with students with *disabilities*... I think our program has really *embraced* that.

Outside of the teacher training program, 4 subjects attributed their success to the history of their programs. Subjects F, I, J, and K believed that important developments in previous decades were still remembered by the pedagogy community and helped in their selection. Subject J stated, "I think the first is that it has a *historical* tradition, so people associated piano pedagogy and [subject's institution]... Piano pedagogy is one of the things they regard historically as an area of strength." Subject F explained the importance of history by saying, "It's *one* of the oldest programs, I mean, it dates from the early *1960s*... and at that time there were very *few*, if any other pedagogy degree programs, and so it got noticed early. It became a *model* during the 70s and 80s."

Five others attributed much of their success to the quality of their students, both current and alumni. These subjects, A, F, G, I, and S, mentioned how students helped the programs' reputation. Subject G, for instance, mentioned the importance of word of mouth, explaining, "Whether they're from the United States or from other countries, I think that after they graduate they speak *well* about our program, and so I think this is an attribute, probably, that has led *to* our selection in the top 20." Explaining how former students can lead by example, Subject I stated:

We've had real *success* over time placing our students in positions. I mean, I can go through four decades of students who have gone through this program that are now in *leadership* positions... I could point to many, *many* people who have gone through." Discussing the students still studying in the program and their merits, Subject A said, "*Our students*, (.) are not only *musically* excellent, but they're *intelligent*, and they're fine *teachers*. So, although the conservatory has a lot of pianists, only a certain number are interested in teaching. And so, when those certain number filter over into me, then I have the best of *teachers* and the best of *performers* and the best of *intelligence*."

Five subjects (C, D, E, M and S) recognized that their programs had a high level of comprehensive and dynamic pedagogy curriculum which would help their schools' reputations.

Subject C explained, “Our curriculum is *never static*... we’re always *changing to reflect* whatever new finds in pedagogy there *are*, and so we’re a *dynamic* pedagogy program.” Several subjects (n=3) explained that their curricular strengths were exceptionally balanced between performance and pedagogy. For instance, Subject H said:

We *value* very strongly here... a combination of very *strong* performance skills as well as very *strong* teaching skills. So we *really* encourage our pedagogy students and work with them as closely as possible to help develop their performance side as well as their observation and their teaching component.

One respondent, Subject A, felt that the program’s library and facilities played an important part in their selection. The respondent said:

The group piano, GP3, National Group Piano Pedagogy forum, has been *held* here three times, so quite a few people have been able to see our *facilities*, and our facilities are *fabulous*. So I think one of the things that helped us is the setup of our group piano situation and our pedagogy *library*... The convention was able to *showcase* the facilities. So the *facilities* are number one.

Two subjects, O and P, suggested that the number of pedagogy courses at their institutions had something to do with their selection. Subject O explained, “We have a bachelor in piano, and we have three undergraduate pedagogy courses, which is also *quite* unique. Most schools do not have three.” Subject O also felt that the specific way in which the school had restructured the pedagogy program helped raise the community’s awareness of their strengths.

The respondent said:

The decision was made to *stop* the program for a variety of reasons, and that gave us a couple of years to *revamp* and restructure, and to think what was important. And that was, we felt, a great program, and this time we wanted to have greater *diversity* and different *approaches* towards teaching and so we established the graduate program in which all our courses are *team taught*. We don’t believe there is just *one* philosophy towards teaching... They are getting a *wide*, different range of *philosophies* and *attitudes*.

Finally, Subject P believed that the program was chosen in part because of the availability of diverse degree options. The respondent explained:

We offer a number of different degree programs... There's a big *variety* of degrees. At the *doctoral* level, there are both a DMA performance pedagogy, plus a Ph.D. program, both are very popular, we have students in both, plus a straight DMA in performance. So I think that the *multiplicity* of degrees... there's a lot of choices for students... They *don't* just have to do one thing... Also, *both* the masters and the doctoral programs have enough *flexibility* in the program that students will elect to- they have to take a certain amount of pedagogy courses, but *no one* takes *all* of our pedagogy courses... I think students have a lot of choices in terms of what they're *interested* in, they can hopefully pursue that, and they're not all taking the *same* thing as they go through, and I think that produces a *lively* environment.

Subjects' Educational Backgrounds

Education could be clearly identified as a defining characteristic of a pedagogy instructor at a leading institution. Of the 20 subjects interviewed, 100 percent held multiple degrees in the field of music. All but 3, Subjects C, L, and O, held doctorates. These three had obtained masters degrees, and Subject L had completed the coursework necessary for a Ph.D. Out of those with completed doctorates, 7 earned a Ph.D., 9 received a D.M. or a DMA, and 1, Subject I, received an Ed.D.

Two subjects, C and D, also pursued bachelors and masters degrees outside of the field, which defined the course of their unique educational views. In addition to music degrees, Subject D earned an undergraduate degree in German, which allowed for further studies in Munster, and the other earned both a bachelors and a masters of science, which led this instructor to develop a pre-college curriculum around the combination of science and art. Along with Subject C, Subjects G, O, and M had become involved in pre-college educational situations, either through summer programs or high school workshops.

Outside of their respective universities, many of these professors were very active contributors to the pedagogical world. Sixteen subjects, were regularly published in magazines and online journals related to piano performance and pedagogy. Of those, 5 subjects had served

either as editors, associate editors, or creators of such periodicals. Seven subjects wrote or co-authored significant texts in the field, and 1 of those, Subject K, had also contributed by writing computer software for use in piano pedagogy.

A large number of these leaders kept themselves visible in the academic world in other ways. Twelve regularly traveled throughout the US and internationally for concerts, and 13 traveled for lecture tours. Other respondents maintained their visibility through committee involvement and organizations of music teachers on the local and national level. The vast majority, 15 of 20 subjects, regularly presented at the meetings of the Music Teachers National Association. Leadership was exercised both in national organizations like MTNA and local groups, with 8 subjects reporting leadership and advocacy within their communities, and 9 reporting significant positions at the national level. Six of these had served as members or chairs of committees.

While most of those interviewed frequently contributed their ongoing research and considerable expertise to publications and conferences, they also pursued various specialized fields. Three subjects, A, E, and R, reported a specialization in adult learners and andragogy, while 5 other subjects, B, F, K, N, and P, specialized in the use of technology. Subjects G, K, and M specialized in diversity and cross-cultural learning, and Subject M once served as a foreign expert abroad.

Curriculum Content

Within the 20 institutions studied by the researcher, a tremendous variety of curricular structures and course offerings emerged. As the interviewed leaders of these programs explained, some schools or universities gave degrees at all three levels of study, while others had

a more limited scope, some had smaller programs than others or more classes than similar schools, and between the 20, there were innumerable specialized courses.

The most apparent contrast between programs was the sort of degrees that the schools offered. On the undergraduate level, schools typically provided either a pedagogy degree (n=7), or a performance degree with pedagogy coursework included, (n=10), although a few other options were also available. Ten programs, represented by Subjects A, C, D, F, H, J, K, M, L, and N, favored the performance degree with supplemental pedagogy. Subject F explained:

We do at the undergraduate level offer a Bachelor of Music in *performance* with an *emphasis* in pedagogy, so somebody would go with a bachelor of music in piano performance and then by taking an extra number of course hours they can get that emphasis.

Discussing why a school would choose this model, Subject A said:

I just want to *tell* you that it's a very big honor to be chosen as one of the top 20 because we *don't* have a pedagogy degree. Which is really *remarkable* if you think about, you know, a pedagogy school without a pedagogy degree. The undergraduate curriculum only includes one year of *required* pedagogy. I could say that's good, I could say it's bad. For us, it's *perfect*, because our undergraduates are performance majors and their mind is *definitely* not in the area of teaching. (.) So, to *force* them into that sort of idea (.) wouldn't be wise. And to change the (.) format of the undergraduate performance criteria to allow pedagogy majors would not fit with the school. So for our undergraduates, we *don't* have a major in pedagogy.

Subject O's school, then, offered a piano degree with a pedagogy minor.

On the other end of the spectrum, 6 subjects, B, E, P, Q, R, and S, offered undergraduate degrees which were actually in pedagogy. Describing the course load, Subject E stated, "Since our pedagogy degree is primarily at the undergraduate level, those *requirements* for student teaching, both private and group are both four-thousand level courses."

Two subjects, G and T, described how pedagogy was barely included at the undergraduate level, if at all. When I asked Subject T if pedagogy courses were offered at the undergraduate level, the respondent explained:

I wish we could, and when I first came... there were two pedagogy courses on the books... They are both, course numbers were at the five-thousand level, and that means they can be taken by upper division undergraduates, that is juniors and seniors, or by graduate students, which can be masters or doctoral students, they can both get credit for it. So you get kind of a mixed class, but it worked. And then we kind of went through a conversion to semesters and we had to redo all our courses and we set it up that, I think it was supposed to be one was undergraduate and one was graduate level, and we just found that there were not the numbers to support that many courses, because the university, as budget cuts come along, they're more and more strict about low enrollments, that if you have a course that doesn't have enough students, it will be cancelled.

Highlighting an unique degree program, Subject I described the open studies program.

The respondent stated:

At the undergrad level, we do it a little differently than most schools, we actually have what we call an *open* studies program, whereas we used to have our undergrad pedagogy majors through the *music ed* area. Now we have a bachelor of music and it's through open studies. The open studies curriculum allows a student to *structure* his or her own program. So with each undergrad pedagogy student, the final course selection may be slightly different. One student at the undergrad level may want to do more emphasis in business for example through the business college. Another student might want to *teach* or play more. We have a *core* that we want people to complete, but it's really nice because the undergrads can *tailor* the degree to their interests. We do meet NASM guidelines for undergraduate pedagogy. Undergraduate pedagogy majors take *two* semesters of pedagogy followed by a *year* of practicum.

Like Subject I's institution, most schools, 12 of the 20, offered two undergraduate semesters of classroom study followed by additional semesters of lab experience. Subjects A, D, E, H, I, J, K, L, M, Q, R, and S reported following this model. Subjects G and T, because of their minimal undergraduate pedagogy involvement, only had one semester of classroom experience. Two others mentioned having considerably more. Subjects B and P offered four semesters. Subject B described the curriculum, saying:

My pedagogy students who are undergraduates, meet along with piano *performance* students who have two courses in piano pedagogy required of them also, so these folks are just learning pedagogy for the *first* time... And the curriculum is quite, (.) it's *amazing*... they take four courses in piano pedagogy, and then they take a practicum, which is like an internship, of course, and then they have to write a research project.

Graduate programs had an even wider range of degree options. Nine

schools only offered either a masters or doctorate, but the remaining 11 institutions offered some combination of degrees at both levels. Within masters programs, 5 schools offered music education degrees with a piano pedagogy emphasis, 4 offered combined performance and pedagogy degrees, and 2 schools offered masters degrees in performance with a pedagogy emphasis. Two schools, represented by Subjects B and F offered multiple degree options. Eleven schools offered a masters degree in pedagogy. Subjects B, C, D, G, H, I, K, L, N, Q, and R represented programs that chose this route. Truly indicative of the countless options available, one subject even broke this path down into more specific components. Explaining how the degree worked at Subject H's institution, the respondent said, "We have a *masters* degree in piano pedagogy that has either a *thesis* track or a *recital* track." When I asked if students chose which track to follow, the subject stated, "Well it's *usually* a combination of their *choice* and faculty *recommendation* when they audition. (.) Although, I do have a masters student right now who initially wanted the recital track but she's decided she would like to do both, so she's going to write a thesis as well." Subjects B, E, F, P, and R mentioned the availability of a masters degree through music education, while F, J, M, and O described a masters of performance and pedagogy. Subject F, who overlapped between these options, explained:

Well, first of all, let me clarify, there are *two* graduate options: a Master of Music in Piano Performance and Pedagogy, so that's a *double* major, 36 hours. (.) We also offer a Master of Music Education with an *emphasis* in piano pedagogy. That's a traditional 30 hours. The double degree, to be admitted, one has to meet the same criteria one would meet to enter a performance-only program, and then to that we add the pedagogy. (.) But let's say somebody is not as interested or skillful in performance, *or* somebody is much more interested in research or teaching, the Master of *Music Education* is an appropriate option for them.

Only two respondents, Subjects S and T, described a masters in performance with any sort of pedagogy emphasis. Subject T detailed:

Officially, I think it's called master of music in piano performance with a pedagogy emphasis, and it really is very close, very similar to the performance degree, so one has to be a very strong performer to get admitted to the degree. There are some programs where a person with a lot of teaching experience who maybe hasn't done as much playing could get it, but it is restrictive because of the nature of the high level of performance.

Within the 12 schools that had doctoral programs of any sort, the types of degrees split into several categories. Some schools, like those represented by Subjects A, D, G, I, K, N, and P, offered a doctorate in performance with a minor, emphasis, or cognate in pedagogy. Some schools, like B, D, E, and G, offered a pedagogy emphasis through a music education degree. J and P were examples of schools that offered joint performance and pedagogy degrees, while C and H were examples of straight doctoral pedagogy degrees. Among these programs, three schools, D, G, and P, offered multiple degree options. Subject P, who crossed these boundaries, listed the variety of degrees as one of the school's chief strengths. The respondent said:

There's a big *variety* of degrees. At the *doctoral* level, there are both a DMA in Performance Pedagogy, plus a Ph.D. program. Both are very popular. We have students in both, plus a straight DMA in Performance. So I think that the *multiplicity* of degrees... there's a lot of choice for students... They *don't* just have to do one thing.

Subject H described how that institution's doctoral degree was similar to their masters program.

The respondent said:

We have a Doctor of Musical Arts degree in Piano Pedagogy, which has either a *recital* track or a *dissertation* track... If I were comparing degrees, the recital track would be more like a performance and pedagogy degree where they do *recitals* and a *paper* at the end. The dissertation track would be more like a *Ph.D.*, only with just a Doctor of Musical Arts in pedagogy instead.

Subject K, felt that degree offerings really ought to be determined by the focus of the institution in question. The respondent stated, "It all depends on your *main* focus. I know that there are some schools that are very much research oriented, that offer a Ph.D. in pedagogy."

Graduate semester requirements were generally very similar to the required number at the undergraduate level. Of those who told the researcher how many semesters their students took, 8

reported two semesters of class time followed by a number of practicum semesters. Subjects D, E, H, K, M, P, S, and T all mentioned this strategy. Subjects A, B, and L were examples of schools that required four semesters, while C, and Q reported five and one semesters, respectively.

Outside of the regular coursework, some schools also mentioned the availability of internships or assistantships. Only six schools discussed this at the undergraduate level, represented by Subjects B, D, J, K, N, and O. While most of these had the standard requirements of an internship, Subject O's institution offered an internship program with a variety of mentors and topics. The respondent explained the style of the internship by saying:

It depends on what they're doing, how the internship is set up... What's the best part is that students have the opportunity to *explore* the areas that they think are important. For instance, one of my students next year, she's not good at *sight reading*, she's a wonderful teacher, but she herself has major deficiencies in sight reading. I've recommended she study with [another instructor] to do her internship with her, learning more sight reading techniques, because that's an area where she's weak... And then the second semester she wants to work more on *technology* with me and learn how to use the Disklavier. Everyone is *different*.

Internships were much more common at the graduate level, with 11 subjects, B, C, D, G, H, I, J, K, L O, and P, mentioning internships or assistantships, either as a requirement or as a form of financial aid to attract graduate students to the program.

Class sizes were fairly standard between the undergraduate and graduate levels. Those that reported, tended to say that they had between 1 and 6 pedagogy students (n=4), or occasionally between 6 and 12 (n=7). Subject D for instance, explained:

It's a fairly small program I would say, the actual pedagogy program. One reason being that I am the only pedagogy faculty member. (.) At the undergraduate level, I just have about *two* majors. (.) I, you know, I sort of believe that at the undergraduate level, it makes more sense to focus on *performance* and get a performance degree, with some pedagogy coursework, some experience, and then specialize more after. So I don't really *push* that undergrad pedagogy major much. And then the masters level, I have about *four* pedagogy majors. (.) And then at the doctoral level, I have *several* minors, (.) gosh, it's

hard to say how many because half of them, they're either in residence or not... Then in *addition* to the pedagogy majors, there's *always* a number of *performance* students who are very interested in teaching that need observation.

Again, most of the graduate programs had similar numbers. Most (n=5) had between 1 and 12 majors, and only 1 mentioned having more than that. Subject F explained, "Generally, we have about 6 to 10 graduate students. (.) I never want to have less than 6, because of the *prep* department. We have to have a certain number of people teach the prep program. But 10 is the maximum."

Across the 20 pedagogy programs, a tremendous variety of courses was offered. While no subject could possibly mention every topic covered within a program's curriculum, representative samples could be taken. Many courses were shared by a large percentage of the schools, while other courses were very specialized and tailored to specific institutions. For the most part, at the undergraduate level, the subjects reported a particular emphasis on basic and intermediate skills. While 10 subjects mentioned that they at least introduced group teaching at the undergraduate level, nearly all of the schools mentioned a stronger focus on private, individual lessons. As an example of the breadth of topics, Subject Q explained:

The important thing is that we are training teachers that will go out and teach students the ability to think musically and to solve problems. (.) We teach them how to conceptualize and diagnose musical problems and how to help their students solve those problems. (.) It is not a lecture approach, but an active participation approach. (.) Topics are the history of technique, style periods, leveling of intermediate repertoire, knowing the various methods, method reviews, teaching music theory, functional skills of improvisation and so forth, educational theory, technology, lesson planning, and certainly more in depth group work, which is a strong feature of our program... Four courses are required for the undergraduate major, and also a lecture in conjunction with a recital... The first course is piano pedagogy, emphasizing the elementary level and also the philosophy of teaching. (.) The second course is piano teaching materials, which emphasizes the intermediate student through the advanced student. The last two courses are both supervised teaching.

Subject K, illustrating the importance of intermediate teaching for undergraduates, described how intermediate teaching fit into the school's program. After describing the first semester, which included training with children, Kindermusic, MusikGarten, and Suzuki, the respondent explained that in the:

Second semester, we spend some time talking about *how* to teach the adult, *adult learning theories* and *methods* that are available... We study *intermediate repertoire*, particularly in reference to appropriate *sequencing*. At this point in the student's progress they're no longer going page by page in a method book, and so it is important for the pedagogy student to be adept at sequencing the materials.

Subject G differed somewhat from many of the other subjects by discussing a curriculum in which units were not divided by age levels, but by skill sets. The respondent stated:

What I try to develop in students is *analytical* skills before teaching skills, I make sure they know how to analyze music. So, whereas some pedagogy courses are structured according to *levels*, like beginning, intermediate, or advanced, or age group, I think I kind of structure the course according to *skills*, so (.) the first skill would be just *analyzing* scores, and then eventually analyzing technique by observing videotapes of master *performers* and analyzing teaching itself by *observing* other teachers, or master teachers, or by watching me teach. So, (.) I kind of focus on those different *skill* areas all through the course.

As mentioned in the previous examples, many schools introduced undergraduate pedagogy students to teaching repertoire, various methods, materials, and the use of technology in an educational setting. Fundamental musicianship skills were also a chief concern, as mentioned by Subject N. The respondent stated:

All of the courses, whether they be the one-on-one pedagogy courses or the group piano pedagogy courses, emphasize the *fundamental*... skills for pianists to survive. (.) So it's, you're talking about physical, aural, and the *ability*, also, to read. So, *physical* adjustments, whether it's working with a *beginning* child and how you work with the *mechanism* that is so weak, and how you build that mechanism, or whether you're going all the way up to advanced pianists, where there are physical adjustments that need to be made (.) due to the *level* of the *repertoire*, or due to misuse of the physical mechanism earlier in their careers, or, you know, it just has to run the *gamut* of how the skills apply to students of various levels.

As Subject N mentioned, wellness and health-related issues were an important topic at several schools (n=3). Other significant course topics in a variety of schools included observation skills (n=5), the skills necessary for studio management (n=5), and style courses (n=1).

Many of these courses were also mentioned when discussing graduate programs. In several cases, as Subject S explained, this was because both levels share a course. The respondent said:

Because our program is quite *small* in terms of numbers, our undergraduate and graduate students enroll in the *same* pedagogy courses, with graduate students completing *additional* work and projects. The undergraduate students complete more basic requirements, with more extensive requirements given to the grad students.

The subject went on to mention many of the same elements mentioned before as making up the pedagogy course load, saying:

Our curriculum covers the fundamentals of piano teaching from basic methods and materials to business aspects of the independent studio. We also explore educational theories and philosophies, so really, our curriculum is quite comprehensive I think. And as I mentioned earlier, I think a very nice thing about our program is that we allow our students to enroll in independent research practice, which gives them more on research topics that are of interest to them.

Echoing a sentiment also mentioned by Subject I, Subject F suggested a rather non-traditional curriculum that initially employs a psychological than a discipline-specific approach to curriculum. The respondent stated:

Here at my program, we have piano pedagogy, we have voice pedagogy, we have instrumental pedagogy. Now a *lot* of what those people need, I think, is *the same*, an understanding of how people learn. Why don't we teach them all *together*? And then have the second course be discipline *specific*, which would be piano repertoire, piano technique, bilateral coordination and those things....Then you really get the people who know their field the *best*. I almost feel like *an imposter* when I try to teach educational psychology. I try to do a couple classes::: Why *not* have a real expert to teach educational psychology and I can teach what I am really expert at, which is *piano* pedagogy....I think we should hold a conference about that, you know, *reconfigure* it again.

Unlike the undergraduate students, graduate students at most institutions focused more on intermediate and advanced students than they did beginners, and while private teaching was still a topic of discussion, group teaching gained much more focus at this level. Once again, repertoire, methods, and the leveling of materials were an important aspect of curricula across the board. Technology was also a key feature of a pedagogy curriculum at the graduate level, and Subject F explained:

The other alternate class in the spring is called Group Piano Procedures, and it's basically a study of *principles* of teaching in a group, not just a lab, but the emphasis is on teaching in a *group*... I'm *thinking* about changing that course in the future. The *reason* that class exists is that when the program was founded, the graduate students did *not* get much experience teaching groups because they were taught exclusively by the faculty. As it's *evolved*, they get quite a lot of teaching in groups now and I *don't* think they really need that course so much anymore. Well, they need the course, but I'm going to call it *Current Trends*, (.) what I mean by that is the application of *technology*, everything from a disklavier to an Ipod to, (.) how to burn a CD of your student's recital, to how to make a video of a lesson and edit it. Those kinds of technological skills, as *well* as really state of the art understanding of research and music education and psychology.

Others mentioned observation (n=4) and studio management (n=2) again, as well as some specialized courses. Some of these included how to make career choices (n=1), improvisation (n=1), chamber music instruction (n=1), the history of pedagogy (n=1), and Yamaha or Suzuki training (n=1). Courses more specific to graduate pedagogy students included research skills (n=4), developing curriculum (n=6), and a lecture recital (n=3). Subject I described the progression from undergraduate to graduate curricula by saying:

Undergraduate piano pedagogy majors take *two* semesters of pedagogy followed by a *year* of practicum. At the masters level, we're really preparing people to enter the profession at some level. The masters degree is *very* important because not all students go on for a *doctorate*, so by the time they finish the masters we really want them to be *well-prepared* as teachers and players. Approximately *half* of our students go on for doctoral work. Doctoral work is really another issue *entirely*. At the doctoral level, I think the main thing is that students need to understand *curriculum*. *How* to build curricula and how to put curricula in place. So the doctoral level is about attaining *very* strong leadership skills in terms of being able to *develop* a program. And we have coursework that supports that direction.

Some subjects had strong views of what they hoped their students would accomplish either before or after working at the subjects' individual institutions. Subject T, for instance, hoped that doctoral students without a masters in pedagogy would come to the school to achieve two degrees. The respondent explained:

There is an option that a number of our DMA students have been taking advantage of... If they come to [our school] as a doctoral student, and they have a masters degree from another university, they can actually obtain a masters in pedagogy concurrently with the DMA in performance, because a lot of the masters credits will count toward performance, you know the piano lit, and the history and so forth, and actually use one of their doctoral recitals to fulfill the pedagogy requirement, so it's really kind of a short cut for them... They can combine the masters in pedagogy with the DMA, but only if they aren't doing a masters in piano at [our school], because you cannot have two masters of music degrees in piano from [our school]; they can only have one.

While this subject hoped that students from other institutions would join that school, Subject H hoped that the students at that institution would go elsewhere. Referring to the joint masters and doctoral class, the subject said, "I usually encourage my masters students to go to other schools so they can get a *broader* perspective, and they can get other ideas and *more* and different teaching experience to help prepare them better for the job market."

Other special considerations came up at various schools regarding curriculum. Subject G found that cross-cultural training was an important element of the school's curriculum. The subject said:

I think it's a strong program in that we have a lot of *international* students, and there's a lot of opportunity for *cross-cultural* training, and I kind of *use* that as an *enhancement* to education... (.) I'm very *aware* that some of our students come from other countries, and (.) I think in some ways our training is very *specific* to American students, but (.) they're gonna take this training and go to other countries where it might not be so *adaptable* or *applicable*, and so I think... while we develop teaching techniques, we also have to develop sensitivity to the *context* of culture in which we train.

Subject F was concerned with preparing students to become productive members of society, as shown when the respondent stated, "I think the challenge we face is *preparing* the pedagogy

students for a successful and fruitful career... *bringing* about the changes in society that will place a *greater* value on participation in music making.” Stressing the importance of certification for students preparing to enter the professional world, Subject Q explained how this would be added to the curriculum, saying, “(N.n) This year, for the first time, students are preparing a portfolio, required for MTNA professional certification. Their lesson plans are designed for inclusion in the portfolio.”

Among favored textbooks, *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* (Uszler, Gordon, & Smith, 1999) was the most commonly used. Eleven schools mentioned using this book in class or strongly recommended it to students. Other books mentioned by several subjects were *Questions and Answers* Clark (1992) (n=4), *A Symposium for Pianists and Teachers* (Berenson, 2002) (n=3), *Practical Piano Pedagogy* (Baker-Jordan, 2004) (n=3), *How to Teach Piano Successfully* (Bastien, 1988) (n=2). The following books were among those that had one subject recommended them: *A Piano Teacher’s Legacy* (Chronister, 2005), *From Mystery to Mastery* (Clarfield, 1996), *Thinking as you Play* (Coats, 2006), *Intelligent Music Teaching* (Duke, 2005), *Piano for the Developing* (Hilley & Olson, 2005), *Ornamentation (Musician)* Lloyd-Watts, 1995), *Creative Piano Teaching* (Lyke, 1996), *Pianist’s Guide to Standard Teaching and Performance Literature* (Magrath, 1995).

Teacher Training

Schools were far more similar on the topic of teacher training opportunities than they were regarding curriculum. While, it was not possible for the subjects to describe every aspect of their programs, a basic representation was provided. At the undergraduate level, programs were fairly evenly split between whether these opportunities were offered through the core

pedagogy classroom curriculum (n=10), or through additional practicums and lab requirements (n=12), with, some programs offering both options. Subject D, one of those whose program included teacher training within the classroom, described the course by saying:

We develop a teaching *philosophy*, (.) spend quite a bit of time on teaching average-aged beginners; we talk about teaching strategies; try them out. Of course, look at methods and other materials. And then, a big *focus* of that class and their *practical* experience is taking part in a *demonstration* class. (N.n.) Every week I teach a group of children, and then immediately following the group class, the pedagogy students teach a *private* lesson to the students.

Similarly, Subject Q explained:

(.) In the first pedagogy course, we teach a group of children together, while the entire class observes. I teach the first lesson, and then the students team teach at least two classes together. (.) Then the next team will teach the following two, and so we cycle through until everyone gets group experience during the semester. They also are required to teach two individual students during the semester. Many times the students are from the group lesson, since these students have a group lesson once a week and an individual lesson once a week. (.) Others are assigned students that take an individual lesson once a week. In the second semester of pedagogy we don't continue the observation of the group lesson, but they continue teaching at least two students through the semester.

Only one institution, represented by Subject N, told the researcher that the undergraduates at that school received no hands-on teacher training. When I asked how they received those experiences, the respondent simply said, "At this time, they do *not*."

At the graduate level, more institutions expected their students to gain experience through practicums and internships than through the classroom studies. Internships were particularly prevalent (n=14) throughout the 20 programs. Subject J described the program by saying:

Students who want to do *more* teaching, and we do have students who take a year of piano pedagogy, and then would like to continue teaching similar students, they register for a *practicum*. We call it *internships* in teaching. Yes, they may register after they've had piano pedagogy coursework, they may continue to teach more, and we do have students, who could be *anything* from children and partner lessons, to group classes, it's up to what the individual student and I *design* for that.

Representing one institution that used hands-on coursework, Subject N stated that students gained experience:

Mostly through the coursework... The students who are in the group piano pedagogy class *do* role-playing, as far as teaching one another in the class, but then they also teach *modules* too.

For those schools that offered teaching experience through practicum (n=19), many more factors appeared. Some schools taught through a prep school (n=12), while others relied on community music schools or local instructors (n=7) and, depending on where the practicum was held, various age groups and class dynamics were provided. As a general rule, the majority of programs, those with an attached preparatory division, used it as a resource, while institutions that did not have a preparatory division employed whatever resources were available.

Referring to the preparatory division, Subject G said:

The undergraduate students have an *option* to teach in the *preparatory* division, but that is administered separately from the piano pedagogy program... it's not (.) closely *coordinated* with the pedagogy program, it's like an *independent*... I don't select the teachers for the prep division, (N.n.) but I select the teaching assistants for the... graduate teaching associates in the *class* piano program.

Expanding on the curriculum within the demonstration class, Subject D stated:

After they have *completed* that pedagogy course and the demo class, they can teach in the *preparatory* division if I say so, if they're interested. So many of them do that, then, in their junior and senior years. That is all *private* teaching. Some of them, also, teach in their own studios or at music stores, or programs through churches, or travel to students' homes.

Circumstances were similar for graduate students, although generally schools were more likely to encourage their graduate students than their undergraduate students to teach in the preparatory division. Explaining this difference, Subject F said:

Every undergraduate piano student has to take practicum for two hours, one hour at a time; if they do the *emphasis* in piano pedagogy, they sign up for practicum for three hours, two times... they work in the piano preparatory department. We can't legally use undergraduate students to *teach* other undergraduate students, so they don't take part in

the class piano program, but they do *three* things under the heading of that practicum. They observe a lot of teaching of different settings and different populations, and different teachers, (.) they *assist* our faculty in group teaching of pre-college aged students, and they actually teach a limited number of pre-college students under faculty supervision. An undergraduate getting that emphasis would probably only get 2 or 3 students, whereas a graduate student would have a minimum of 5 or 6 and *up to* 12 or 13... At the undergraduate level, we call this a practicum. At the graduate level, we call it an internship. But it is the *same* thing, it's just a question of *how much*... supervision.

Subject S spoke of teacher training by saying:

The way we facilitate this is through our *community music school*... and it serves as our *laboratory* teaching both children through adults. We also offer a *children's* program, what we call a piano preparatory program, which is a very strategically-*designed* curriculum which begins with *both* a group and applied private lesson for children, and this is directed by [a person], who teaches those courses, and we also work *directly* with the piano pedagogy faculty on that... Many of the grad students, of course, teach *adults* as well, so they're experiencing that teaching on all different levels and age groups... And another aspect that we consider important in terms of teacher *training and experience* is just the opportunity for the students to be active in MTNA.

For many schools that relied on local instructors to supervise and serve as examples for their students, MTNA provided a powerful outlet. When I asked Subject D how students were able to observe local teachers, the respondent said:

I've become *acquainted* with the local chapter of MTNA here, and I've gotten to *know*, (.) you know, from judging the students, going to recitals, and talking with the teachers, who the really *strong* teachers are, and there are a lot of them here... what I do is simply call or e-mail the teachers and ask if they're *willing* to have students observe them and then ask them to give times at which, you know, they're willing to be observed, and then have the *students* call or e-mail them a couple of weeks ahead of time to tell them when they will be coming to make sure that it's all right. (.) I think the last time I taught that course they did about eight observations and they had to see at least three different teachers.

In a similar setting, Subject T explained:

They must also do *12* observations during the semester, which is 15 weeks. I give them questions to answer as they write up their observations. Unfortunately, we do not have a preparatory program on campus, and that's one of our limitations. We really *won't* have that because we just don't have the *staff* for it; we don't have the studio *space* to teach, and we don't have enough parking. But they can go downtown to [a local conservatory], which is three miles away; they have some *wonderful* faculty and they've been very nice about letting my students *observe*. So they can watch some really good teachers at *all*

levels and write up what they see. They can also go to private studios. I give them a list of independent teachers in the *area* that welcome observers, other community music schools, or they can visit Yamaha *classes* or Suzuki programs. Sometimes they observe piano classes, especially if they've never had any experience with class piano, so I usually send them to some of the very experienced *TAs*.

Sometimes community relationships prevented programs from pursuing other training outlets, as was the case for Subject H, who described the school's preparatory program as:

Fairly small... We *do* keep it that small specifically because a lot of the private teachers here in the area are *very* good friends of the school of music and the university, and we don't want to *compete* with them. Because they're *very*, very good to us as far as offering opportunities for *workshops* to our students.

As far as the student populations provided for teacher training experiences, many schools were able to provide a broad range of private, group, children, college-age, and adult leisure students. While some schools could only offer their students whatever skill level was available through enrollment, others had the ability to provide a personalized teacher training experience, tailored to their students. Introducing the school's philosophy for undergraduate teacher training, Subject A explained:

I teach the student; they watch me, then they teach them on their own. Then the next quarter they teach in *front* of me, and I observe *every* lesson and evaluate. And then the next quarter, they take over the student themselves. So in other words, I *gently* release the student to their responsibility.

Going on to tell how the program becomes more personalized at the graduate level, the subject said:

They also have what's called '*supervised teaching*,' as part of that curriculum. In supervised teaching we fill in the *gaps*. Sometimes my graduate students have been teaching children, but they have never taught adults. So I'll put them in an adult class. Maybe they've taught one on one, but have never taught a group. So it's *very* independent, the supervised teaching. *And*, in that supervised teaching, they can supervise with me, but our *local* piano teachers are also willing to supervise them. And so, often I send them out to work with a *Suzuki* teacher, (.) or a *kindermusic* teacher, or a *group piano* teacher for children... So we're lucky to have a very supportive community.

Limiting this personalization to the doctoral level, Subject I described the same concept, saying:

At the doctoral level, people come in with varying *backgrounds*. Some people may have, for example, more experience teaching college group piano, other people may have *less* experience teaching (students) at the pre-college level. In summary, at the doctoral level we really *refine* the teaching experience for each student, at the masters level we do teaching *internships* that are part of the courses, and likewise, at the undergrad level we have teaching *practicums*.

Instructor's Qualifications

When asked for their opinions regarding a pedagogy instructor's ideal qualifications, the interviewed leaders were generally in agreement. Fifteen of the subjects stated that the official degree title was mostly unimportant when considering a teacher's ability to work in a university pedagogy program.

Of those 15, a wide range of reasons surfaced to justify that conclusion. Eleven subjects, A, B, C, D, E, H, J, O, P, Q, and S, suggested that the title for pedagogy faculty did not matter so long as the degree provided the instructor with a balanced education. When asked whether a Ph.D. or a DMA better serves a pedagogy professor, Subject P said, "I *don't* think that makes any difference at all." The content of the degree is much more important, and the respondent explained, "I think being a good musician still underpins being a really good teacher. You don't have to win competitions or anything, but you have got to be an artistic person, and really understand." Further explaining how a balanced education can provide stronger qualifications than a specific title, Subject J reiterated, "I do think it is important that they are in a degree program which includes a *heavy* pedagogy component, (.) and that allows them to continue to play the piano and develop as pianists." When I asked to clarify this focus on the content of

individual training rather than a specific title, the subject said, “What’s in a degree program, you can’t absolutely determine that by the title of the degree.”

Six subjects agreed that when hiring a pedagogy instructor, a stronger emphasis should be placed on personal experience than the title of a degree. Subjects B, K, L, O, R, and T supported this idea. Subject R, for instance, said:

The *most* important qualification that there is for a pedagogy teacher is to have taught *hundreds* of children... I felt such a concern about students who were...going straight into a university teaching pedagogy *without* much teaching experience, because it was all theory.

Others, like Subjects B and O, felt that experience was important in connection to an equality of focus. Subject O explained, “I would prefer somebody who comes from a performance and pedagogy background combined.”

Some subjects believed that, although no single degree should be considered the best qualification for a pedagogy instructor, different institutions may have certain preferences. Subjects D, K, and T suggested that a student’s individual goals and career plans should dictate which title to pursue. Subject K explained, “It all depends on your *main* focus... If you’re going to be heading a program that offers a *Ph.D.* with a very strong research component, I think a good background in *research*, is necessary.”

Others demonstrated a slight preference in one direction or another, but emphasized that other factors were more important than the title when hiring pedagogy faculty. Subject S had a specific preference, but remained very open to any degree. Although the respondent suggested a terminal degree, either a *Ph.D.* or a *DMA* for the amount of experience it provided, Subject S emphasized, “I think there are outstanding teachers out there who have simply a masters degree or a bachelors degree who would be fine pedagogy instructors as well.” While Subjects A and B leaned towards a *DMA*, Subject E looked slightly more towards a *Ph.D.*, and Subject L

emphasized the general need for a pedagogy degree with a diverse education and a high level of experience to support it. Further explaining the need for balance, even within the respondent's own personal tendency, Subject A said:

I have a problem (.) with people who go straight pedagogy without developing their *performance*... People can choose to *specialize*, but if you're teaching pedagogy, you should be familiar with the *whole* depth. So I really think, probably the ideal situation is a DMA with a *minor* or a *cognate* in piano pedagogy.

When I asked how pedagogy should be attached to the degree, the subject responded, "Performance and pedagogy should be equal footing. I really believe that."

Other faculty members expressed less leniency as to what title the ideal pedagogy instructor should hold. Subject G, for instance, stated a strong preference for a doctor of music in piano performance and pedagogy by saying, "It's a degree that *integrates* applied study in performance with study in pedagogy... I think it's balanced." Although the reasoning still centered on a balanced education, the subject believed one degree offered that more efficiently. Three others expressed a strong preference for a Ph.D. when considering a pedagogy instructor's qualifications. Subjects I, N, and F favored this degree so long as it was combined with a strong performance education, and Subject F took it a step further to include a continuing professional performance career. The respondent explained the need for "a person with a very strong *foundation* in performance at a *professional* level. I would prefer that be at least through the masters level, and then one in which the performing career goes on." As for why a Ph.D. was better suited to a balanced education, Subject F said:

Even in a DMA in performance and pedagogy... there's *such* focus on performance, and the *time* it takes to play all those recitals, one is not likely to acquire the *breadth* or the knowledge of the *research* base or research *methodology*.

One other subject demonstrated a strong preference for a single degree, but remained open to pedagogy instructors with different titles and qualifications. Subject M, who

recommended a doctorate in music education with an emphasis in piano pedagogy, suggested, “I think having diversity [in the faculty] would be nothing but *great* for the program.”

Finances

Piano pedagogy finances were a difficulty, even for the leaders of the field. All but 3 of the 20 interviewed subjects reported not having any sort of independent budget strictly for pedagogical use. Subject N said, without any further explanation, “We have *no budget*.” When I pressed the subject for more information, asking “You have no control over this part?” the subject simply answered, “Not at all (hhh).” Other subjects volunteered a little bit more information, like Subject K who explained, “(.) I have to say that, as in most *public* schools, most public universities, the finances are *not* good... We don’t have a specifically pedagogy budget.” Many were more optimistic about their circumstances. Subject O, for instance, said, “Now I just put it in [to the dean] and magically I was able to get it.”

Even schools with an independent budget faced difficulties, however. Subject A’s program, for example, worked with a small independent budget. The respondent explained, “We don’t have a *budget*, so to speak... I have a certain amount of money, and I believe it’s \$500... And that’s ridiculously low.” Another school was fortunate enough to have a small but reasonable sum at its disposal. Subject J said, “I do have a *small*, independent budget that I can use as I see fit, to buy equipment or whatever.” Without a sizeable pedagogy budget, faculty members had to look elsewhere for financial support, and one school with an independent budget, represented by Subject L, showed how that could be done. Although Subject L’s institution had a separate budget, it was very closely connected to the school’s preparatory program, a route some schools without budgets chose to pursue. Subject L said:

The preparatory funds have been used to help the pedagogy division purchase equipment and materials... In the same way the pedagogy students who teach as part of their assistantship for us, we are paying them as faculty and the money is generated *for* their teaching.

While 11 of the surveyed schools relied on a pedagogy program for funding, each used these budgets for different purposes. Three schools, represented by Subjects C, D, and L, used the preparatory students' tuition to pay for pedagogy assistantships. Subjects K, R, and Q primarily used tuition money as a self-sustaining force for the preparatory program itself. Subject K explained, "For the children, they pay a fee, and that fee goes to pay... the graduate students will actually be in charge of the class, (.) so that will be used for paying that and for buying materials." However, Subject R said, "I am not paying the teachers anything because they are *student teachers*, so the money that comes in as *tuition* is used to *buy* the MusikGarten materials." Rather than giving that money to pedagogy students for any reason, the respondent used all of the money to keep the program supplied with materials. Subject F also could not afford to set any of the tuition aside for student teachers or assistantship stipends, and instead used those funds to pay the academic faculty working in the preparatory division. One program, headed by Subject M, used the funds raised by the school's group piano program to pay for new technology, and three others, represented by Subjects H, I, and J, primarily used preparatory tuition for the general needs of the pedagogy program. Subject I explained, "All that money goes into a special *account*... and then, the pedagogy department can *use* that account to *buy* things for the program."

Many programs relied on their university's general funds for the majority of their budget. Twelve subjects reported having to petition through the administration for use of general tuition and fees for pedagogical purposes. Specifically, 9 discussed receiving funds through the school of music. As Subject I said, "The other type of financing is the financing that is through the

academic unit, and for that we have to work through the *director's* office like anybody else.”

Particularly in larger schools, competition could make obtaining those funds a difficult task.

Subject Q explained:

Each area of the music program vies for the same scholarship money. (N.n) Maintenance and care of instruments and purchase of new instruments and a piano lab are problems.

As with the preparatory tuition, different programs reported various uses for school of music budgets. Four subjects, G, H, I, and K, told of using school funds primarily for supporting assistantships. Subject T explained how money from the school of music supported visiting instructors. The respondent said:

I just found out that I *can* get a little money for bringing in guest presenters. I used to get them to come for *free*, and they were very nice about that, but this year I am going to try to get at least a little honorarium for the guests.

Subject K's program achieved the same ability to bring in guest instructors through the use of the school's keyboard budget. Three other programs, represented by Subjects A, B, and G, used technical fees and student fees to improve piano labs. Explaining how those funds were applied, Subject G said, “We do have a *technology* fee for the school of music, and for *maintenance* of the piano lab, you know, I just make *requests* for whatever I need in terms of technology.”

Some schools got a welcome boost from grants or endowments established for the piano pedagogy program. Subjects F and P were fortunate enough to receive this extra help, and Subject P explained, “We do have... a piano pedagogy *endowment* that was created by someone who left money for the program, and we can do some purchasing of materials with that money.” Both of these schools also reported relying on other sources of income; Subject F used funds from the preparatory program, and Subject P discussed applying for funds through the school of music.

Beyond the official budgets and funds, 4 of the interviewed subjects explained how free materials helped them make ends meet. Subjects D, G, M, and R all requested texts from the major publishers. They asked for free copies and, as Subject M explained, “When publishers send us free copies, when they are able to *give* to our pedagogy library... I *use* those in my pedagogy courses to keep current with materials, and when they give them to me for *free*, that’s a big *help*.”

Two respondents expressed gratitude for financial and resource support they had received. Subjects B and K told how administrative support made financial situations easier, and Subject K went on to acknowledge how local support made the institution’s piano lab possible. Subject B said, “We have got a *really, really*, wonderful dean right now... He is saying, ‘You know, *whatever* you need, tell me. *Write it down*, we’re going to make it happen.’” Explaining the support at Subject K’s institution, the respondent said:

I have to say, the *library* is very responsive to my requests... We’re lucky in many ways, for instance, the piano lab, we have an agreement with a keyboard seller here in Denver. It’s a *loan* agreement, so we get new electronic pianos every single year.

Although many subjects responded to the topic of finances with frustration or longing, others had surprising reactions. For instance, Subjects C and J seemed fully satisfied with the funds they could obtain. Subject C explained, “I’m in the process of replacing one of my digital piano laboratories and the money for that is going to come from the music department, and that will be about \$40,000.” Still others, Subjects E and O, were not involved in the budgetary process at all, and therefore had little idea how finances in their programs worked. Subject E confided, “Well, to be very honest... I really do not hear any information about budget. I really have no idea where the money comes *from* or how much money is allotted.”

Technology

The leaders of the top 20 university piano pedagogy programs approached the subject of technology in a variety of ways. When I asked how technology was implemented and taught within each subject's school, the leaders noted a diverse list of knowledge, equipment, software, and curricular uses.

Five subjects, A, E, F, H, and K, responded that they felt particularly comfortable and knowledgeable regarding the latest and most up-to-date technologies. Some, like Subject A, felt that this level of comprehension and hi-tech integration was reflected in the quality of the program as a whole. The respondent explained:

I think, really *truly*, that's *one* of the reasons we're on the top 20 list, is because I'm really up on the technology. You know, (.) I *never* was afraid of it... Plus, I am a strong *believer* in looking for the people who are experts and getting their support.

Like Subject A, Subject H also enlisted the support of technical experts on staff to assist in the use and upkeep of pedagogy equipment. Subject E also responded to the researcher's question with a positive assertion of technological understanding. The subject said, "I'm *pretty* comfortable with it, and I actually *enjoy* finding new ways of incorporating it into our program. I probably enjoy it more than my *students* do."

On the other side of the technology gap, 6 respondents expressed regret that they did not know more about the latest hi-tech pedagogical resources. These 6, Subjects B, D, J, O, R, and T, understood the importance of technology in a curriculum, and hoped for the ability to incorporate it in the future. When I asked how technology was used in Subject T's program, the respondent said, "*Not* very much. It's not one of my strengths, though I *wish* it were. I've tried learning... It's a combination of the time and so much else to do... We *do* have an overhead

projector and transparencies!” Four of these 6, Subjects B, J, O, and T, reported reliance on technical staff to meet the program’s needs. Subject B explained:

I am not a big technology buff, but this is on my wish list of things I *want* to have, (.) is a really *great* technology person on staff with me. I work with the contemporary media person on our faculty and he does a lot of demonstrations *for* us.

In terms of the specific technologies used in these programs, the interviewed subjects provided a broad range of equipment. Sixteen of the 20 mentioned the use of sequencing and recording technology, including how to teach with a Disklavier. These subjects were A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, K, L, M, O, P, Q, and T. Subject E explained how this technology fit into the curriculum by saying:

I do some, what I call ‘*traditional* technology activities,’ by now they’re considered traditional, where we use a digital *sequencer*, and where we do projects where we learn how to record onto a sequencer and play back and manipulate the sounds and what not.

While explaining the various technological categories employed at Subject I’s institution, the subject said:

Another category... is *recording*, using Disklaviers or Clavinovas for sequencing... They also have to turn in a *disk* at the end of the semester where they have to take a piece and record *six tracks*, and for 99 percent of the students, they’ve not done this before.

Piano labs also surfaced as a popular form of technology among these leaders. Fifteen subjects brought up these facilities in their discussion on what role technology played in their programs. Subjects A, B, C, D, F, G, H, J, K, L, N P, Q, R, and S all explained how students learn and teach within piano labs on their respective campuses. Explaining the piano lab’s equipment, Subject S said:

We have two group piano *laboratories*, one is a Yamaha lab, the other is a Technics lab, both labs are *equipped* with computer stations at each digital piano. One lab, the Yamaha lab, has Mac G5 computers, and the other has Dell PC systems as computers.

Sometimes these labs also assisted in the implementation of other technologies. For instance, Subject G explained, “We have a Claver Nova lab with 16 pianos, (.) and we have a *separate* lab for *sequencing*, (.) with keyboards and computers for Finale and other forms of sequencing.”

Some other forms of technology were mentioned by two or three schools as important teaching tools within their programs. Three subjects, A, O, and P, reported the use of video in the teaching process. Subject A said:

What we *have* are two piano laboratories that are divided by a *viewing* room, and in that viewing room you can actually, there’s TV cameras set up so you can *watch* what’s going on, in both teaching studios and *record it*, either on DVD or VHS.

Even without advanced facilities, Subject O expressed the importance of video recording by saying:

I have always videotaped lessons, and I think that’s very *important* for students, and I *encourage* my students, for instance, when they do an internship, to videotape themselves teaching, and then to observe *themselves*, and then I’ll watch the videotape and we’ll *compare*.

Three schools, represented by Subjects A, D, and F, also mentioned using visualizers in the classroom. Subject A explained this technology by saying, “We use the *visualizers*... A visualizer is a big, (.) like, a box, that when you play the piano the keys *shine up*, or the staff shines up so they know what you’re *playing*.” Some schools, led by Subjects A, F, and N, mentioned advanced projection equipment. Two of the schools talked about using ceiling-mounted projectors that allowed the students to see what is on the instructor’s computer screen, and Subject A explained the use of a unique projection technology. The respondent said, “We try to stay away from illegal copying as much as possible, and so we’re able to, by using a document camera, put music (.) up on a projector for the whole room to see on a big screen, and the students can sight read.” Subject I mentioned the use of spreadsheets for administrative purposes, and finally, two schools, led by Subjects B and I, used technology for long distance

teaching purposes. Subject B explained, “We’re going to be teaching on the *internet* – well, we already are – we can teach, we can sit here and teach a student in China, *right now*.”

Some common technological choices also appeared when I asked what software instructors used in the classroom. These leaders mentioned many different kinds of software ranging from notation, sequencing, and composing software, to theory and web design programs. Seven subjects told the researcher that they used Music Ace (2003): Harmonic Vision, just as 7 subjects reported using Finale (2006): eMedia. Four mentioned Sibelius (2004), and 4 emphasized the role of website creation in their programs. Mozilla (2005) was recommended as a free program for this purpose. Three subjects said they used Home Concert (2000): Time Warp Technologies, and 3 used Band in a Box (2006): PG Music. Audacity (2006): Audacity, MIDIsaurus (1999): Town 4 Kids, and the software accompanying *Piano for the Developing Musician* (Hilley & Olson, 2005) were each brought up by 3 subjects, and Alfred’s software and the Performer series by 2 subjects were represented as well.

The subjects introduced this technology into the curriculum in a variety of ways. Mostly, the respondents mentioned giving assignments within the core pedagogy classes. Fourteen respondents, Subjects A, B, C, E, F, G, I, K, L, M, N, O, P, and Q, gave students regular exposure through demonstrations, assignments, and projects. Subject K explained the practical technology curriculum by saying:

One of the assignments is for them to take an intermediate-level piece, something like Kabalevsky, or anything, Schumann or anything, and to *create an orchestrated* accompaniment to the piece. So they learn how to use a *sequencer*, a MIDI sequencer to create MIDI files.

The subject went on to further explain:

They also learn how to edit *sound* for instance, one of the assignments for the intermediate level course is, they need to learn a number of intermediate pieces and *play* them in *class*. I record those pieces and they later have to edit those pieces, get rid of

unwanted noise, for instance, or *splice* it. And then they learn to burn a CD and they learn to export it as an *mp3* file, so the mp3 file is then posted on their personal website.

Subject P, similarly, had the students take a hands-on approach to learning technology. The respondent explained:

I *divided* up every aspect of the new keyboards – sequencing, using multiple sounds, recording – and everyone *chose* one aspect of the keyboard to learn about and then, they had to *teach* us how to use it.

Other schools found other ways to incorporate technology. Five schools, led by Subjects D, G, H, J, and T, had specific courses set up to teach pedagogy, oftentimes through the music education department. Subject D explained, “I’m *lucky*... that we have a really *terrific* music technology sequence offered by the *music ed* department... she is an *absolute* expert and teaches so much better than I could ever.” Subject H went into more specific detail of how students learned within these external situations. The respondent said:

I advise them to take one of these extra courses, and then we work closely with that faculty member to see that our student is doing a *specific* project that they can spend an entire semester on instead of just maybe a two-week project, so that they can get more out of the experience.

Two schools, represented by Subjects G and R, also found another way to use technology through a more traditional source. Subject G explained:

We use a lot of *videotapes* in the core course, to view presentations... And also to *view* performances of outstanding performers... and I use that as models of *technique* so that we analyze *movement*, so there’s a lot of video technology.

Finally, one instructor had a very different reaction to the use of technology. Although the respondent’s program did implement technology, Subject R found it necessary to take some measures against technology. The subject said:

I require them to do a *paper* each semester... I have had to put in the *syllabus* that I *want* them to access, I want them to know how to use, the *Music Index*, which most of them don’t even know. I have occasionally gotten papers that were *totally* based on stuff they found when they *Googled* the subject of the paper, and I have had to make some

restrictions that I want at least *three* sources in the paper to have come from a *real book*, or a *real journal*, or a *real magazine*. It could be an *online* journal, but *not* just “I’m a teacher and this is what I think” sites on the web.

Largest Challenges to Programs

When I asked the 20 interviewed subjects what they saw as the largest challenge facing their program, the respondents supplied the familiar, expected concerns, along with a number of surprising and unique difficulties.

The most common challenge, with 7 respondents reporting trouble, was the difficulty of limits within the faculty. Subjects A, D, E, H, K, R, and T remarked how they had too much work, oftentimes as the only pedagogy faculty member, to dedicate enough time to the coursework or supervising the students’ teaching experiences and providing feedback. Subject D explained the situation by saying:

With like 500 music majors and there’s only *one* piano pedagogy faculty member... I’m responsible for coordinating the *pedagogy* program, the *group* piano program, the *prep* program, advising the *TAs*, *studying*, *researching*, and stuff like that. So it’s really a *challenge*, to be able to *supervise* the teaching of the students as much as, ideally, I would like to.

Subject T described other regrets, and other things that could be done if another pedagogy faculty member were hired. The respondent answered the researcher, “Well, I guess these are all *related*: not having a *preparatory* program and being the *only* person doing class piano and pedagogy; those are related. In addition, I am not currently teaching *young* kids myself... I’m really too much involved with supervising the *TAs*... so I can’t speak as much from my own current experience, and they don’t have a chance to observe a *live* teaching demonstration.”

With a similar concern, 4 respondents attributed their problems to time constraints with their students. Subjects H, M, P, and R worried that the learning process was too rushed and wished for more time. For instance, Subject H said:

(N.n.) Oh, I think always observation and feedback... There's just a *limited* amount of time, and a limited amount of bodies, and we're trying to give our students meaningful *feedback*, and as much of it as possible. I think that's one of the reasons that we've gone so *much* to have them work out in the *community* is that they just have more chances for more people to give them as much feedback as possible... It's a time issue, (.) and I feel that it's *so* important.

Four others listed their greatest concern as money and budgeting. Subjects N, P, Q, and S felt that most other problems facing their programs could be resolved if there were simply more money in their hands. As Subject S said:

It's *funding*, and finding those resources in terms of financial abilities to purchase new equipment and the latest in technology and offer competitive scholarships and those sorts of things. (.) We have been hit particularly *hard* with the *poor* financial situation of the state and local economy right now, so that has been particularly reflected in our school of music budget, and *especially* the college of fine arts.

Tied into the worry about finding sufficient funds was the fear of cuts, both in budget and in faculty, as mentioned by Subjects I, K, and Q. Describing the problems at Subject Q's institution, the respondent said, "Well, it's really tied to budget. (.) Our state seems to continually cut. Even when we have higher enrollment, it doesn't seem to matter... I'm concerned about our facilities, the aging building." Subject I explained various ways that monetary cuts could endanger a pedagogy program's success. The subject explained:

The *biggest* issue for many programs, including our program is not getting cuts... If you don't have the tuition *wavers* and you don't have the assistantships, you can't *attract* students... The other big thing is *faculty lines*. When a faculty member retires, that we keep the position defined as piano pedagogy, and that the position is not eliminated or allocated to another instructional area. This has been a *major* problem nationally in the piano pedagogy field.

Three schools, led by Subjects C, D, and O, listed technology as their chief concern, either because of limits in finances, or limits in faculty knowledge. Subject O explained the problem by saying:

I'd say we still have to improve more with getting students more familiar with *technology*, I'd say that's where we are the weakest... I mean, we don't use it that much, but I think for teachers today, they'd better know *more* about technology.

Another challenge facing schools was the number and general quality of students admitted to their pedagogy programs. Three instructors, Subjects J, L, and N, listed this problem as their greatest concern. Subject L said:

The biggest challenge is because we have such an esteemed, *high-powered* piano faculty that attracts really talented performance majors from all over the world and their admission is based on their audition, the *stronger* performers major in piano performance, and the *less* strong performers tend to major in piano pedagogy. So we have to fight for them.

Others, represented by Subjects G and R, worried about the numbers and characteristics of students accepted into their preparatory programs. When asked what the largest challenge was, Subject R explained:

There's the challenge of finding the *right* children to participate in the keyboard for children program. Although it's a large community music school, we have about 900 students that come, you need someone who has *not* had any piano lessons, and who is going into second or third grade. So that's always a challenge to *find* those students, and to try to get a *commitment* from the parents that they will stay at least a year.

Three instructors provided unique statements about the challenges facing pedagogy programs, both individually and nationally. Subject N worried about the curriculum, saying it would probably help "to have the pedagogy courses required of *all pianists*," and Subject B was concerned about how well the program could handle increased diversity. The respondent said:

We are seeing a big change in demographics. Our school has a *huge* number of international students... And so there is sometimes the language problem... But what I'm finding that I'm needing to do is I'm having to change *my focus* a little bit. (.) Because folks who are coming from different countries have very different expectations and backgrounds and so I'm having to try to be really *sensitive* to my students and say, 'What do they *really* need?'

Finally, Subject F attached institution's challenge to a much larger, societal problem. The subject explained:

I think the challenge we face is *preparing* the pedagogy students for a successful and fruitful career, so the greatest challenge we face is the challenge they face, and that is *bringing* about the changes in society that will place a *grater* value on participation in music making... That can only happen, I think, *one* person at a time, when somebody realizes that being involved in making music is *really* worthwhile, and the *effort* it takes and what you spend on lessons is really worthwhile because it doesn't show up as *immediate* gratification, it doesn't make a person thinner, or make them more tan, or sexier, or it doesn't make them more money, but sort of the timeless *inherent* value in great art.

Improvements to Programs

The researcher asked what each of the subjects, when considering all of the challenges facing their programs, would like to improve immediately. Many responded very practically. The methods by which they hoped to improve their programs were evenly spread, in alignment with the challenges they faced.

Five respondents, Subjects F, I, K, P, and S, focused on improving the financial situation and allowing the rest to follow. Subject F defined the circumstances by saying:

(N.n) Well, we're having a *budgetary* problem right now, and I would like to resolve the budgetary problem so that I can pay the staff *better*... I think they should be *paid* a lot more than they are, and I don't have the money to pay them, and right now, since the prep department isn't making more money, I don't have the resources for that.

Also longing for a better and more stable financial situation, Subject I explained, "We do *OK*, but actually the other thing... if I were dreaming, would be some type of *endowment* for piano pedagogy... That's a long term issue." While Subject F and I identified the problem they would like to eliminate immediately, Subject K suggested some broad ideas for how to go about achieving financial goal. The respondent said, "It's the university *level*, (.) so I mean, advocating

for money for *higher* education, so voting for senators who will *increase* that or governors who will support higher education in their own states.”

Other instructors said that their first step would be to hire more faculty. These 4 respondents, Subjects A, D, J, and L, felt that more people would help conquer a variety of their schools’ problems. For instance, Subject D said:

If it were possible to *hire* another pedagogy faculty member who could perhaps oversee the *preparatory* division, do some *teaching* in the program, and especially *supervise* student teachers, that would be most helpful here.

In laying out an improvement strategy, Subject A mentioned problems with finances and curriculum, but pointed to faculty needs as the chief step towards improvement. When I asked if there was a way to add a new faculty member, Subject A replied, “(N.n.) Unless we start a *masters* in pedagogy. If there’s a *masters* in pedagogy, then we would have to hire another person. With the *economy* right now, it’s on *hold*, but it’s *something* to look for in the future.”

Some of the subjects directed their attention towards improving the abilities of the teacher training program to meet students’ various needs. Unfortunately for these 5 institutions, represented by Subjects B, E, H, M, and R, tangible solutions seemed to be lacking. For instance, Subject B explained:

I would like to be able to somehow, *magically* be able to be the best teacher for all these different students’ needs. It used to be that (.) the students were more needing the same thing, needing to hear the same thing, and now it seems like it’s much *more* diverse. (.) I just wish that I could clone myself.

Subject M found the same trouble and said:

Well, and this would be impossible, I just need *more* time. (.) I would like to work with each student more... I try to make up for that with them watching their own teaching, which has *helped*, but I would love to spend *more* time with them *individually*.

Four respondents, Subjects A, F, I, and N, not only wanted general improvements to their programs, but looked towards dramatic degree program and curricular shifts. Subject N, for

example, answered the researcher's question of how to improve by saying, "Probably to have the pedagogy courses required of *all pianists*." Another example, Subject F, wanted to breathe fresh life into the program as a whole. The respondent said:

I think that even in this program we are prone to fall *victim* to teaching the way we were taught. The way people parent the way they were parented. (.) And we know so much more than we did 10 or 15 years ago about how people learn and how people acquire skill, it's all out there in the research, but I don't see much of that research coming *back* to help us be better teachers, and so I think there's a *gap* there I want to address in the curriculum... Most of what we teach is very *old*. And if it's going to live *beyond* the near future, I think it's going to have to *benefit* from new knowledge and new technology."

Along these lines, Subjects C, F, and O supported improving technology to help improve their pedagogy programs. Subject O said, "*Technology*, that's why I'm bringing in outside people in next year to help train them." Others had already made great progress in improving the technological aspects of their programs and were looking forward to seeing those benefits reflected in their students. For instance, Subject C explained:

It is the *technology*, (.) and as a matter of fact, I'm trying to improve it by replacing the laboratory with *updated* technology... We will have new keyboards and they will be *much* more up to date, and easier to use, and have more *features*, and so that one is actually being taken care of.

Also needing an update were some of the school's facilities. Two respondents, Subjects G and Q, would choose to immediately improve the facilities at their institutions. Subject G said:

I guess I would *update* and *expand* our facilities because we have, we are limited in facilities, that's one reason we can't really expand our preparatory division, is we don't really have *space*... I would like to have... a resource center where students could *browse* through educational materials.

The subject went on to explain how steps had been taken to implement this plan by saying, "The school of music has *requested* a new building, and the university is aware of that, but (.) *financing* for a new building for the school of music is, you know, (.) very *problematic*."

One subject had very little hope that any immediate action could be taken to address any of the program's challenges. Subject T described the lack of accessible options, saying:

I don't see any easy way to really deal with any of those things, because I *don't* think we could get another faculty member in pedagogy right now, and even if we could, I don't think we would ever have the capability of doing a *real* preparatory program.

Ideal Programs

In response to the researcher asking what the 20 subjects' ideal programs would look like, most of the instructors replied in the same way. For the most part, the respondents were happy with their programs and considered them to be near any ideal they could possibly consider. When I pushed them to really dream, however, they all contributed ideas for how a perfect program would be run.

Half of the respondents felt that their programs needed curricular changes. Subjects B, C, F, H, I, K, M, N, Q, and R all would have liked to adjust their class content in some way, either adding or taking away or instituting more of a drastic overhaul. Subject H wanted a stronger emphasis on performance, while 6 others wanted to add significant amounts of pedagogy coursework. For example, Subject F described how to create the perfect program by saying:

I would create *longer* days so that graduate students could have time to practice enough *as well as* do their academic work *as well as* teach. Of course I'm joking when I say create longer days, but I've often thought maybe of going to a *three* year program in which the first year would probably be nothing but *typical* performance masters where they'd really focus on piano performing; they'd take pedagogy courses but probably not do a lot of teaching. The second year they'd *continue* in performance... and start their teaching internship, the third year *devoted* to nothing *but* teaching... Now that starts to sound more like the *doctoral* program... but that would be my dream; one that I don't think is likely to occur.

Others would try to work within the already established time limitations and change the focus of the curriculum to include more options and practical preparations for the professional world. Subject Q, for instance, said:

I would envision graduates from all pedagogy programs meeting curriculum standards for each level of degree... such as the pedagogy curriculum articulated by the National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy... I envision each graduate becoming a Nationally Certified Teacher of Music through the MTNA Professional Certification program. I think that will more readily prepare students for their teaching future than just the pedagogy component of a class.

Explaining how this kind of idea curriculum would help prepare a student for the profession, Subject F discussed:

Training not future pedagogy professors, but future teachers. The handful who go on to be pedagogy professors are going to be in the *minority*, and the majority and the true bright spot in the whole field is in independent teaching. That's where one can go into the world and if you know what you're doing and have a lot of energy and an entrepreneurial spirit you can make a great life and a great living for yourself.

Still others would alter assignments to encourage students to add a creative touch which could be valuable outside of the classroom. Subject B explained:

I love having my students play lecture recitals. I'd like for them to do *more* of that... We're trying to *encourage* our students to use media and be very creative, because I think that might be some of the direction that performance is going in on the piano, in general. So, one of my students this year did a program on Spanish music and she brought in an actual Spanish dancer who demonstrated traditional dances of Spain prior to playing her pieces... I think that's so appealing and it makes piano performance so *alive* for people. (.) And *plus*, people get experience. That's similar to what you have to do at MTNA when you come to do a session.

Another respondent described a completely different way to view the very core of a pedagogy curriculum. Describing an ideal program, Subject I said:

When you look at other areas of higher education music schools, *most* disciplines or areas do not have *developed pedagogy*... Instead of having a remarkably developed undergraduate piano pedagogy program, why not have an undergraduate *music pedagogy program* in which *any discipline* can participate. You could have a piano track, you could have a string track, a vocal track. I think that's the *future*.

Eight subjects approached the concept of an ideal piano pedagogy program through the technical resources and the facilities available in the school. These 8, Subjects C, E, F, G, K, O, S, and T, dreamed of having more up-to-date schools. Subject G, for instance, said:

I think (.) that I would have two *separate* keyboard labs, and an adjoining workspace... so that we can *offer* more sections, more space for *group* teaching. And I would have, nearby, (.) a classroom that is *equipped* with video playback equipment... I guess to reach my ideal, better facilities would be the best thing.

Others, like Subject O, who were otherwise completely satisfied with their programs, would simply add more space. The respondent explained, “In my *fantasy* I would love it if we had more studios is the only thing I would do differently, I wish the students had access to (.) you know, *better* teaching studios with equipment and a *better* pedagogy library.”

Another aspect of an ideal program, according to 8 of the 20 subjects, would be a change in the way teacher training programs were run. These 8, Subjects A, B, D, E, F, H, K, and N, either did not have a preparatory program, or would have liked to make it stronger, more specifically tailored, or more diverse. Subject D explained:

To be able to *observe* lots of wonderful group and private teaching, and then to do it yourself and be *supervised* would be essential. (N.n) For college, those who are interested in *college* teaching, they also need the same opportunities to observe *artistic* teaching and to teach themselves and be supervised. They also need to be able to teach children and adults, and then of course college students, both private and group, *many*, many teaching experiences, like running a group piano program or a pedagogy program.

Describing how to establish the desired balance of the training program with other coursework, Subject H said:

I think we’re *very* lucky here in that our applied faculty are very *committed* to the teaching end as well, and so every year I *revise* my coursework... We’re reducing a little bit of the *subject* matter that maybe isn’t necessary in a pedagogy course, and doing *a lot* more observation with *a lot* more feedback, in class and outside of class.

Five respondents, Subjects A, K, L, P, and T, felt that changes in faculty would help them achieve an ideal program. Subject A said:

My ideal program would have *somebody* for *each* specialty area for them to work with. I'm a group piano specialist, I'm an adult specialist. So they have me. (.) But to have somebody that's a specialist in teaching kindermusic, or Suzuki, that they could work *very carefully* and hand in hand with. *That* would be included in the ideal pedagogy program.

Along with a broader spectrum of specializations, some felt that just the additional viewpoints would be beneficial. As Subject J described:

What I would chose, if I could yet enhance, would be what we talked about as what I think is my drawback. *Another faculty member*, because I think it's good for the students to have the *perspective* of more, you know, they figure out what I'm about after a while and it's good for them to share ideas with someone else.

Besides the need for additional faculty members, Subject L suggested taking on additional students, as having both could help achieve the ideal. The respondent said:

I think that an ideal pedagogy program would have *many* piano pedagogy majors so that the class would be big and resources were coming in through tuition to have many faculty members with specific areas of specialization.

An ideal pedagogy program may not be limited to what goes on inside school walls, and 3 subjects, K, M, and S, addressed the importance of community in a perfect program. Subject M, expanding on the teacher training aspect, said:

I think [it] would help in preparing students... if they could *shadow* an independent teacher, or business owner, as far as someone who owns a conservatory or something like that... They could work within the *community*.

Others suggested community in an even broader sense. One respondent, Subject S, explained:

This might be a little bit *esoteric* and *abstracted* thinking, but if I'm dreaming of the perfect pedagogy program, I also must be *dreaming* of thriving artistic communities, not only in the United States, but *around the world*, because when that's occurring, we know that students are going to be successful in terms of *placing* jobs and being successful financially when they leave the walls of our school.

Finally, 2 leaders felt that a stronger cooperation between the performance and pedagogy professors within a school could help to create the ideal program. These 2, Subjects E and T, looked to models of integration and saw the benefits. Subject T explained:

I *visited* [another institution], and I was impressed not only by the fact that they have *several* people teaching pedagogy and class piano, but also because the applied faculty is *very much* committed, *very supportive* of the pedagogy program. That doesn't happen at every school, because applied faculty sometimes have different agendas.

Ideal Degrees

The researcher also asked the 20 subjects to consider the different research available on ideal piano pedagogy degrees and how that would fit in with an ideal program. Some research has suggested that pedagogy should be combined with performance, while some research has suggested that pedagogy and performance should be separated. Both ideologies had supporters within the leaders of the top 20 piano pedagogy programs.

For the doctoral level, 10 of the subjects agreed with the research proposing combined performance and pedagogy degrees. These subjects, B, C, D, G, H, K, L, O, P, and T, all believed that these types of programs would better serve their students. Subject G explained:

The *more* integrated the better. (.) What we have here, especially at the doctoral level, are very *specialized* degrees... and I think they are *overly* specialized. (.) I think the degree that I had as a student was more appropriate, was more helpful, or more *practical*. A degree that *combines* performance and pedagogy is more useful.

Others who felt the same suggested various rationales for why a combined degree would be more beneficial. Subject D, for instance, who felt that a DM or a DMA was most appropriate, said:

Well, (N.n) I think performance and pedagogy really go *hand* in hand... I mean, the students who are interested in majoring in *performance* think they want to perform as a career, many of them, *most* of them will not be able to support themselves solely on performance, obviously. So they *need* to be able to teach, and I *hope*... to really get them *interested* in teaching and *see* it as a *noble* profession, and something fun and interesting, and something that takes as much thought and skill as *performing*... I think our practicing and performance really informs our *teaching* and vice-versa. And, (N.n) as I mentioned before, in terms of applying for a job, you can't be so *teaching-focused* that you have lost your chops. So for someone who loves the music and loves to play, it's hard to imagine going through a day without, really *making* music.

Subject H shared these sentiments and foretold a very bleak future for piano, saying:

I think a *marriage* between performance and pedagogy. I can understand why research would say that it's not the best way to go, but then you have to look at the *reality*. (.) And, in the job market today, almost *no* one is going to make their living in one way or another, in *full* or in *part* from teaching, and it's really the *future* of the profession. And if a pianist does not know *how* they do what they do, (.) and *how* to communicate that to another person, then it will be the end. (.) Piano playing will eventually just disappear. (.) Because we can write about it as much as we want, but in the end, nobody *really* learns to play the piano from a book. It's knowledge that is passed in an oral and an aural tradition from one person to the next, so I think we *all* need to (.) accept that charge of learning to figure out *how* we do what we do and how to *communicate* that to another person... This is what my students *hate* hearing from me the most, the dreaded *how to*. Whenever they answer a question, I always follow it up with, "that's great, but *how* do you do it?" They *hate* hearing that (hhh.)

Only 2 subjects promoted a strict separation of degrees, allowing for more specialization at the doctoral level. These subjects, R and S, felt that at the highest level of education, students should be focusing more on a single discipline. Subject R stated:

At the doctorate level, I'm *not* sure if a DMA is appropriate or not, because I think it calls for a level of *commitment* and a level of playing that is *not* always done by the kind of person who is going to be *interested* in teaching *average beginners*... As chair of the community music school, I have *hired* several young teachers who... are finishing a DMA. I find that their *focus* and their understanding of *why* a child is taking lessons, the average child, becomes a little *skewed*. I think that the doctorate of pedagogy should be given over *almost* entirely in how to train *teachers*. At the bachelors level we learn how to teach little kids and beginners. At the masters level we learn how to teach beginners, intermediate and advanced. But at the *doctoral* we *should* be teaching how to teach the bachelors and the masters students, and I'm not sure all of the programs are *doing* that yet.

Six respondents, Subjects A, E, I, J, M, and N, felt that there was room for both kinds of degrees at the doctoral level. Some felt that individual degrees should be tailored to students or institutions, and others believed that the degree was not incredibly significant, so long as a strong balance of emphases was provided. Subject J explained:

I never think I have the answer for people at other campuses because student *bodies* are different backgrounds. But our students come here with very *strong* performance credentials and very strong performance backgrounds, and if you *separate* pedagogy, then those students end up feeling very *different* from the rest of the piano (students), and it's not *good* for pedagogy on *my* campus... I feel because I deal with the students who are here and I know where they're coming from, and where they think they're *going*, and

you always have to *tailor* your pedagogy to the backgrounds and goals of the students you teach.

Explaining the other angle, Subject E stated:

I would support either. I guess it would be like a *Ph.D.*, which would be more academically structured, but it still needs to have some performance *component* to it. (.) But I think, whether it's called a performance degree with emphasis, or whether it's a Ph.D. in pedagogy with performance emphasis, I think, as *long* as there still is that *mixture* of performance and pedagogy at all levels, I would think that would be best.

Subjects F and Q did not specify what an ideal degree in their programs would look like at the doctoral level.

The subjects responded in greater harmony when I asked what degrees would be offered at the masters level in an ideal program. Fifteen of them, all but Subjects A, I, M, O, and S, supported a combined performance and pedagogy degree for masters students. Subject K explained the reasoning by saying:

//I strongly feel that they should be *combined*. (.) Our masters is a masters in performance and pedagogy, it's *both* things... we don't want to take people who basically, you know, might have talent as teachers but they can not *play* the piano, because, perhaps, if you are not very *proficient* at piano you can maybe start with teaching at the very elementary level, but, you know, it's *not* ideal either. But as soon as you get into the intermediate level, you need an *artist*, in spite of being a *good* teacher, you need someone who is really *artistic* as a pianist. So I don't believe in programs that separate the 2 areas, (.) because you end up with someone who knows a lot about research, knows a lot about bibliography, but perhaps can not sit down and *play* a Mozart sonata, and I mean, how can you teach someone to be a good pianist at the highest artistic level if you *can not* do it yourself.

Further exploring the idea of pedagogues being looked down upon as somehow lacking in talent, Subject R said:

I think certainly at the masters level, it should be *both*. The reason being that I think they say if you can't perform you *should* teach, and I don't agree with this, I think that you are a much better teacher if you are *performing* yourself – if you're having to approach and solve your own musical and technical problems. And the other reason, *conversely*, not only do I think it makes you a better teacher, I think it makes you a better *pianist*.

Describing how an ideal program would handle the shifts of specialization needs, Subject E said:

I like the idea of combining the 2 degrees. (.) I think as you get *further* into the graduate level, I think maybe we still *need* emphasis on performance and pedagogy, but maybe more emphasis on the *research* component, or more of the pedagogy aspects while still *retaining* the performance aspect.

Three of those who did not agree, Subjects A, I, and S, felt that a masters degree was a time for more specialization and separation of the degrees. Subject I explained a number of reasons for this belief, saying:

I personally *favor* having *separate* degrees at the masters level, but I have to explain this. Our masters degree in piano pedagogy, it is a *separate* degree from piano performance. But you might say, well why not combine it, but here's the *advantage* for us. I have had students do a performance masters at other universities, but they could still come here and do a second masters in *pedagogy*. But if we *combined* the degree and called it a masters degree in piano performance and piano pedagogy, then students *would not* be able to do that... The other thing that happens is students come here for piano pedagogy and they *stay* for a second masters in piano performance... Another hidden advantage is that by pursuing two masters degrees, the student does not have to *move up* to the *doctoral* level, they can stay another year and continue to study and develop as a pianist and a teacher.

Finally, two respondents suggested that both kinds of programs should be considered in the ideal scheme. These 2, Subjects M and O, believed that different students could benefit from either one, depending on the circumstances. Subject M said:

I think that depends on where that student is. (N.n) My masters was in *performance*, and I think that was good timing for me because that's when I was developing those skills... That's where I was in my life, that's where I needed to be, I needed to be *doing* that. Not that anyone ever develops them to the point of, "OK, I'm done." We're always *working* on that.

Very similar answers were provided when the interviewed subjects considered the undergraduate level. Fifteen, everyone except Subjects A, G, N, O, and T, believed that the degrees should, at least in some capacity, be combined. Many more were reluctant at this level, and felt that the main focus should be performance, but all 15 at least felt that pedagogy courses

should be a part of the undergraduate curriculum. Subject M said, ‘I certainly think they need to be developing their *performance* skills.’ However, the subject continued:

I think having *training* in piano teaching, learning how to teach piano is *certainly* fine at that level, I just wouldn’t want it to be such a *pedagogy emphasis* that the performance skills are not being developed. (.) So, I think having both is fine, (.) especially when, at that age, they have that interest in teaching. (.) I get *excited* when the undergraduates get excited about teaching. It’s just great because it’s really *rewarding* to see them get all excited about piano teaching.

Subject F approached the issue in a somewhat broader and practical sense, saying:

Well here I’ll *reveal* some of my prejudices, because I *really* tend to think the bachelors degree should be a time when 2 things happen, when one attains a professional level of skill as a *musician*, in other words a bachelor of music and performance, and one becomes a well-educated, well-rounded *human being*, in other words *liberal arts* education. (.) And in my *ideal* world, those 2 things would happen and for the most part, the *need* for an undergraduate pedagogy degree doesn’t exist in that world. They become a player and an educated person, and then at the masters level, that’s when they really focus on pedagogy. Now, would they take courses at the undergraduate level? Yes, 1 or 2 courses, to get some experience, some exposure, I call it *exposure* as opposed to *experience*. So they begin to see *options* and begin to see if they’re *interested*.

Four subjects, A, G, N, and T, believed that undergraduates should choose between the separation offered by more specialized options. For instance, Subject A simply said, “No pedagogy degree on bachelors. A bachelors degree, either a performance degree or a music education degree.” Subject T explained:

I don’t think there would be any value *in* adding a bachelors degree in pedagogy. The students really need the bachelors in performance just to develop their piano *skills* and build a foundation for their musicianship. A pedagogy for the bachelors level wouldn’t be *helpful* for our program.

Many subjects were fortunate enough to already have their ideal degree programs in place. Subject J, for instance, whose ideal included a combined degree on equal footing, described how the program already offered that option. The subject stated:

Our degrees are all *combined* with performance, and we have philosophically talked about this many times, and always *decided* that that was the *best* educational option for our students... (.) Because... our students come here with very *strong* performance

credentials and very strong performance backgrounds, and if you *separate* pedagogy, then those students end up feeling very *different* from the rest of the pianists.

Possible Obstacles to Obtaining Ideal Programs

When I asked what obstacles would stand in the way of the subjects as they tried to actualize the ideal piano pedagogy program, the respondents spoke with an incredible show of unanimity. Out of the 20 leaders, all but 1, Subject C, reported that a lack of resources was preventing them from realizing their pedagogical dreams.

More than half explained that they needed more funds to achieve their goals. These 11, Subjects A, E, F, G, H, J, K, O, P, Q, and S, felt that generally, with more money, the rest of their challenges could be overcome. Subject A, for instance, could solve faculty problems with a budget to pay salaries. The respondent explained:

Money is always an obstacle. You can't *afford* to hire people. I am fortunate that the local piano teachers are *willing* to supervise my teachers, and to do it for *free*. But ideally we should be paying them, (.) and we should have someone onsite.

Others wanted more money to pay for the best students. Subject O said:

I mean our *greatest* obstacle is that we don't have enough money to give people full assistantships and things like that, so that's the only thing I'm sad about. Other schools have *lots* more money and sometimes there's a great student and they'd love to come study with one of us, but they can't afford it because we're not giving them as much money as other schools, so that's my *biggest* obstacle.

Whatever the problem, it could be handled, but money was the chief concern. Subject J described the problem by saying:

It's probably *budgetary* more than anything. The idea that it would not be *possible* to add another faculty member at this point as long as things are sort of running OK, I think it's probably budgetary. It's not *philosophical*, I'm lucky because the piano faculty is very supportive.

Other schools faced the opposite problem of Subject J and faced opposition, either from the performance faculty, the administration, or simply a general lack of support for a controversial new idea. Three schools, led by Subjects E, I, and J, mentioned the obstacle of handling opposition or lack of understanding from their colleagues. Subject E explained, “The support of other faculty members *is* limited, and in some cases *non-existent*, or even at *odds* with other teachers’ perspectives, so there’s a lot of, (.) you know, disagreement, maybe, in that regard.”

Time was another important resource that a large number of respondents felt was lacking. Seven schools, represented by Subjects B, D, F, I, M, N, and R, wished they could have more hours in a day, or more course hours in a semester and that their programs would be significantly closer to the ideal with that consideration. When describing the ideal pedagogy program, Subject D joked, “I guess this program would last about::(hhh) 10 years.” When asked why time was such a challenge, the respondent said:

You *can’t* possibly address everything, so that’s, (.) just *time* is a problem... just faculty time and availability to really, *personally* oversee every single student and make sure they’re getting what they need in terms of coursework and internships.

Other instructors who wanted to implement curricular changes on the road to a more ideal program found that certain things just could not be done with the inherent time constraints of a university program. Subject B explained how time limits got in the way of desired changes by saying, “Maybe the workshops and other things if I can figure out how to do it in the curriculum without making it just too much for the students. Sometimes you just make it too long.”

Some subjects listed limits on the number of pedagogy faculty as another considerable challenge against an ideal program, and one that was closely tied to other obstacles. Three

subjects, B, K, and T, mentioned this trouble as one aspect of the greater problems. For instance, Subject K explained:

I think the main obstacle would of course be getting the *funding*; that would be an obstacle. The other would be, you know, to run an ideal program we would probably need a couple *people* teaching in the pedagogy area, so *1* person is not enough and that might be an *obstacle* because I'm not sure if we're planning to expand, I don't see that happening in the near future, so that might be an obstacle.

Facility deficiencies were another obstacle facing schools. Four leaders, Subjects B, K, L, and T, mentioned how they would like to expand but were greatly limited in their abilities without the costly addition of a new building. Subject T explained:

Space is a big obstacle, because I have 11 TAs sharing *one* TA office, and that's a lot. And even then we're running out of space, because we have 45 fulltime faculty and about 45 adjunct, and the practice rooms are *heavily* in use, so we've had to restrict the hours that the non-majors can practice because it's too *crowded*.

When asked about obstacles, Subject L replied:

The number one that I see is *space* (.) because (my institution) is in the process of trying very hard to raise money to build new buildings. But, with the existing building that we have, (.) even if we were to have an incoming class of 20 graduate students or whatever. Just having spaces for the existing faculty loads and also space for them to teach, we utilize every single room in this building. (.) Right now, we utilize *every* space, every hour and every day.

Only 1 subject described an obstacle that didn't have to do with resource problems and approached the question from a more curricular standpoint. Because Subject C's ideal vision included a curricular shift to require a significant number of pedagogy courses before the student taught anyone else, the entrance requirements would need to be very strict. The respondent defined the problem by saying:

(.) It's practically *impossible* to bring in a new graduate student and *require* them to do as I want if they haven't had any teaching experience. *Because*, a lot of the time the only time they can come to a graduate school is if they have some sort of *financial* aid, and most of our financial aid is in the form of *teaching assistantships*. So that is the problem.

Possible Solutions to Ideal Program Obstacles

After identifying the obstacles blocking the subjects' paths towards a more ideal pedagogy program, I asked the 20 leaders to suggest some possible solutions with which to overcome these problems. Once again, the respondents were able to come forward with a broad sample of ideas to improve their programs.

Many looked to provide answers and suggested some concrete possibilities. Half of the 20 subjects believed that money would be able to solve the problems facing pedagogy programs. Within this group of 10, the respondents divided into two sections, each approaching finances in different ways.

Six of them, Subjects A, F, K, L, Q, and S, thought that a major donor or an endowment would be the best solution. Subject A explained how money was both the problem and the solution by saying:

The obstacle for that is: if they are mentoring my pedagogy students, they really should be *compensated* for that. So *money*, again, is the obstacle. A *solution* for that could be, perhaps, (.) is to get somebody to endow it. Get somebody to give money towards it, you know, somebody that cares about the *arts* and cares about teaching *children*, to give money towards a pedagogy program. *That* would be a solution.../I'm talking about individual *donors*. I think a donor would be ideal. And sees the value of a *good* teacher, and that they would endow money towards teaching.

Subject F felt the same, but also shared the views of the other group which felt support was a critical financial factor. The respondent said:

If I were *able* to convince the top level administration, the president and the provost of the university that they had to support this program at a *higher* level, that's an obstacle I've *never* been successful in doing. Because we're already pretty well supported, I don't mean to sound like I'm complaining. In fact I feel fortunate and very *blessed*. To make it *closer* to perfection, a major new *budget* created by the university, and the realist in me says that the only way that would ever happen is *if* a truly major *donor* who was really *interested* in this specific aspect of our program were to make a *gift* of 5 million dollars to the piano pedagogy program (.) which would *allow* us then to either build or rebuild the facility to be perfectly tailored.

Four others, Subjects G, I, J, and N, offered the same sentiment as Subject F in that a pedagogy program must find a way to convince the administration and the rest of the piano faculty to support the program's needs. Subject I said:

I think that whatever happens in the discipline, whether you call it *piano* pedagogy or *music* pedagogy, there *has to* be support from the administration, and there *has to* be support from NASM. Any of the problems right now in the country, *nationally*, in the field of pedagogy, can almost *always* be traced to budget cuts and cuts of faculty and of staff, and we *have to* overcome that, and that means *educating* administrators. I worry about any new administrator who comes in, who *isn't* really clued in to piano... Current DMA students *struggle* to get positions.

When I asked specifically how administrators could be convinced, the subject replied, "If your program *places* people in *positions*... I think that *raises* a strong awareness of how important it is."

Three respondents, Subjects D, G, and H, believed that support in the local community and from local instructors was a necessity for overcoming obstacles. As Subject H explained:

Developing, you know, *relationships* that are going to pay off down the road... I consider them, in *many* ways, to be our pedagogy faculty as well. (.) The students will get more real *life* information and experience from them than they will in the so-called *Ivory Tower* of the university. Those teachers are out there doing the real work every day, so I really *do* consider them to be pedagogy faculty... They've encountered *every* problem you could imagine.

Others suggested adjustments to curriculum in order to make more efficient use of time.

Four instructors, Subjects B, C, M, and Q, each had an idea how course loads could be changed to streamline the process. Subject M proposed, "perhaps being *aware* of workshops or summer types of things they could participate in, (.) that's not a three hour credit or electives." Subject C brought up the possibility of prerequisites for pedagogy majors, and Subject Q suggested, "Combining courses could serve graduate, undergraduate, and community people as well." One more idea was to expand a program beyond its current boundaries. Subject B offered, "I think

that if you have a doctoral degree that you can *do* a lot of these things... So I think that with further degrees that you can do more of this; there's more of an umbrella."

Two subjects felt that solutions could be found within preparatory divisions. These 2, Subjects A and E, either wanted to expand current preparatory programs, or create a division in an institution without one. Subject E, explaining the problems and how a preparatory division filled the gap, said:

I don't see a *real* solution there, other than just *budgeting* more for it. *But*, if a preparatory program was in existence, I know *a lot* of times the preparatory program can generate a lot of *income* which would sometimes help defer the *cost* of technology as well as other things that you may need in your program that aren't necessarily budgeted for. (.) So, I think that some kind of *prep program* has *a lot* of possibilities both for *teacher training* and generation of some income.

Subjects L and O suggested that solutions could be found by working with admissions. By raising expectations or maintaining already high standards of acceptance, Subject L believed that a program could send a message to administrators and financiers, while Subject O felt that working closely and efficiently with the admissions staff could help to attract students and make the most of limited finances. Subject O explained:

I keep working with *financial aid* to try to get the better students and try to come up with more money for assistantships, so I can *keep* trying, (N.n) but that, you know, money is money and I can't pull it out of the air. (.) But I would say, there again, last year they were *very* slow in getting back, we lost several *key* people last year because they were too slow and I made a big stink about it. And this year our assistantships went out right away, and I can tell you, this is what's *amazing*, we had such a good group, *every* single kid of the 7 that applied, they all got in, and they're all coming.

Some subjects thought that programs had to simply learn to use whatever resources were available to the best of their abilities. These 2, Subjects D and P, emphasized that prioritization was the strongest solution. Subject P explained:

We have to be very *careful* what we ask for or demand, because it means we're not going to get other things. (.) We went through this big process of – we got a *lot* of, it was a *big* purchase to replace these two piano labs... The piano campaign is even larger, we won't

– it *won't* even cross our minds to ask for new faculty positions any time soon. You can *only* ask for so much, or you start *hurting* yourself... You have to make your *choices* and decide which battles you'll *fight*. *What* the most important thing to keep *pushing* for is. Those have felt kind of like the things we're in more *dire need of*. If your *equipment* is falling apart you can't do anything.

Even with all of these possible solutions, some obstacles just seemed to be too large and insurmountable, and magic seemed to be the only possible answer. Subject F said:

And then time is the obvious obstacle... It's a *struggle* that in many ways mirrors the struggle that will continue all their life if they remain in this field, that is, the struggle between being a musician, being a teacher, being a scholar, and having a *life*... If I could wave a wand so that one problem could go away, that would be the one.

Two of the respondents, Subjects R and T, still felt that they did not have any clear solutions to the challenges for ideal programs, and were hopeful that more ideas would become available soon. When I asked if Subject R saw any possible solutions, the leader responded, “No, I really haven't figured out anything yet, sorry. Maybe your dissertation will come up with lots of ideas and it will tell me how to do this.”

Conclusion

Based on the recommendations of the 29 participants of the 2002 National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum (GP3) conference, I compiled a list of the 20 leading piano pedagogy programs in the United States. Through interviews with the 20 leaders of these programs, I explored 13 categories related to 2 research questions. These questions and the leaders' responses provided a picture of the status and vision of pedagogy programs; they depicted the current status, as well as the ideal programs that leaders would like to create. Although each institution had its own individual and unique characteristics, the 20 schools shared many similarities regarding how they saw themselves, what stood between them and what they would like to be, and how they hoped to overcome such obstacles.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Introduction

The two major research questions of this study were: “What is the current status of 20 prominent piano pedagogy programs?” and “what is the vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy program from the perspective of 20 piano pedagogy leaders?” Subjects were the leaders of the top 20 US university piano pedagogy programs that were recommended by a group of 29 piano pedagogues who taught university piano pedagogy courses and participated in the National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum, 2002. A survey study with 12 interview questions and one web-based question was used as the instrument for the study. Eight interview questions and one web-based question regarding program strength, subjects’ educational backgrounds, curriculum content, teacher training, instructors, finances, technology, largest challenge, and most desired improvement were designed to answer the first research question: “What is the current status of 20 prominent piano pedagogy programs?” Four interview questions regarding an ideal piano pedagogy program, an ideal degree, possible obstacles and possible solutions were designed to answer the second research question: “What is the vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy program from the perspective of 20 piano pedagogy leaders?”

The results showed that faculty, curriculum, and teacher training were three top factors that were perceived to have contributed to the quality of the programs. The results of the web-based search question showed that most subjects held a doctoral degree in music and had diverse training in performance and pedagogy. In addition, they had high visibility in the public. The curricular content and degree options were diverse across the selected programs. The content of teacher training included private and group teaching from the beginning level to the advanced

level. The perceived best qualifications of a piano pedagogy instructor were to have a balanced education which included performance skill, pedagogical knowledge, and extensive teaching experiences with all ages and all levels of students. Most programs had small or no budget for the program, however, the preparatory program was perceived to be an enhancement to teacher training program finances. Technology was cited as an important resource in many of the programs. The greatest challenges that existed in programs were faculty acquisition and financial limitations. Gaining more money for the programs was the most common improvement priority for programs.

To envision an ideal future piano pedagogy program, most leaders stated that an ideal program should contain diverse curriculum content, significant amounts of teacher training, and many resources. The ideal degree offered in the ideal piano pedagogy program was stated to be a degree combining excellent performance skill development and pedagogy knowledge with diverse teaching experiences. The chief obstacles that kept most subjects' dreams from coming true were a lack of money, lack of resources and time limits within a degree. To overcome the obstacles, the subjects recommended finding a major donor who would be particularly devoted to a pedagogy program, and developing a preparatory program to generate money. Collaborating with other divisions' faculty members and having administrators with positive attitudes toward pedagogy could help programs to gain more resources, as needed. Placing more piano pedagogues in leadership positions could raise awareness of the importance of piano pedagogy programs. Encouraging students to participate in workshops, conferences, and seminars could enrich the training within a degree.

Conclusion

Faculty, curriculum content and teacher training were the top three factors cited as being the reasons why leaders felt their programs had been selected to the list of the top 20 US university piano pedagogy programs. Faculty members were the most commonly reported factor in regard to program quality. In many of the selected programs, faculty had high visibility in the public field as was also cited in Uszler and Larimer (1984), who found that visibility through participation in conferences was important in the establishment of piano pedagogy programs. In the current study, the programs' performance and pedagogy faculties also had well-known reputations that served to attract students from all over the world. Therefore, a growing pedagogy's faculty might wish to consider presenting papers at conferences to promote the school's reputation.

Another top factor that was perceived to have contributed to the rating of the top 20 best programs was the diverse curricular content in many selected schools. Many of the programs had strong teamwork from different divisions' faculty members to offer diverse courses in the curriculum. Since most programs only have one instructor to handle the entire program, collaborating with other faculty from different divisions to develop a diverse curriculum may also serve to develop strength in the pedagogy area. However, the size of the programs may be another factor that may affect the possibility of collaborating with other divisions' faculty members. In a smaller program it may be easier to collaborate than in a larger program.

The curricular content described by the 20 subjects was similar at the undergraduate and graduate levels, but had additional work and a more advanced level of teaching materials at the graduate level. The most favored textbooks were *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* (Uszler, Gordon, & Smith, 1999), *A Symposium for Pianists and Teachers* (Berenson, 2002), and

Questions and Answers (Clark, 1992). The required pedagogy courses ranged from two to four courses with many schools requiring additional semesters of lab experience. As in previous research, Sturm, Tames, Jackson and Burn (2002/2001), the particular emphases in the undergraduate degree were on the basic and intermediate levels of instruction, including teaching methods for private and group instruction, courses for professional development, the business of the teaching profession, the use of technology, fundamental musicianship, supervised student teaching and recitals. Therefore, a growing pedagogy program may wish to consider covering these basic topics in their curriculum to provide fundamental training for pedagogy students.

In contrast to the results of previous studies, several changes can be seen in regard to the status of program curricular content. Unlike studies of Lyke (1968) and MTNA (1990) that found that the status of group teaching was not prevalent in the curriculum, the current results found that group teaching was considered to be valuable in the curriculum, even though many selected programs still had a stronger focus on one-on-one instruction. As a result, a growing program may wish to consider adding group teaching instruction into the curriculum.

Also, technology was an important component of the curricular content in most selected programs through core courses, special technology offerings, other departments, or through the music education division, as was also found in Brubaker (1997), Charoenwongse (1999), Johnson, (2003) and Uszler (1992), but not found in Renfrow's (1991) documentation of passive attitudes toward technology. In the 20 programs, piano labs were the most commonly cited facility. Computer technology, sequencing, recording technology, camcorders, DisKlaviers, were the top listed equipment. Various software was used, including notation, sequencing, composing, Finale, Home Concert, Band in a Box, and the software accompanying Hilley's piano text. A growing program might consider using these resources to strengthen the program's

technological offerings. Clearly, finances are needed in order to make the addition of technology a viable option to a developing program. How to obtain additional finances for upgrading and maintaining the technology is another issue for a growing program to consider.

Besides the most commonly mentioned topics in the selected programs' curricular content, other topics were also recommended by some subjects to enhance a comprehensive curriculum for the future. These were: instruction of learning theory, as was also found in Uszler and Larimer (1984), instruction of composition, improvisation, jazz and rock idioms, as was also found in Wolfersberger (1988), instruction of international issues, cross-cultural issues, social changes, availability of certificate programs, as was also found in Uszler (1985), individual courses, as was found in Uszler and Larimer (1986), a research component, as was found in Milliman (1991), adult teaching, as was found in Johnson (2003), and diverse teacher training experiences from early childhood to college class piano teaching, both in one-on-one and group settings, as was suggested by Johnson (2003). Subjects suggested that if the disciplines were not a pedagogy instructor's strength, a pedagogy program could collaborate with different divisions' faculty members, such as faculty from the music education division, jazz, or technology departments to offer specialized topics that could strengthen the diversity of the curriculum content. Therefore, a growing program may also wish to consider including or rotating some of these special topics in the program's curricular content and/or working with other areas to expand a program's curricular offerings.

Also in the area of curriculum, the quality of the teacher training program was perceived to be an influential component of quality piano pedagogy programs. The teacher training component was one of the lengthiest discussions from most subjects, as was also found by Montandon (1999), who found that the issues of teacher training and curriculum were the two

topics that were most frequently discussed in the history of the conference proceedings. The current study's results showed that the selected programs tended to have strong teacher training programs, and that they provided multiple types of teacher training for their pedagogy students, including private and group teaching from pre-school children to adult students. In addition to observing faculty teaching, hands-on teaching had a special emphasis in most selected programs through core courses, practicums, internships, preparatory programs, or through affiliations with local music teacher associations. The results showed a change from MTNA's (1990) finding that observation was at the core of teacher training. A growing program may wish to consider developing diverse teacher training components, highlighting multiple teaching styles through core courses, practicums, internships, preparatory programs or through affiliations with local music teacher associations in their curricula.

In the current study, internships and teaching assistantships became the primary teacher training experiences that graduate students gained in many of the selected programs. This result was contrary to Lyman's (1991) finding that the availability of internships was limited for graduate students because of shortages of funds. Some programs also had individualized or specialized internships that were team taught across different divisions. As a result, a growing program may wish to consider collaborating with different divisions to offer diverse internships, such as a college teaching internship with a performance division's faculty, or an early childhood internship with an education department's faculty.

An established preparatory department was perceived to play a major role in terms of teacher training, as was also found in Uszler and Larimer (1984). The preparatory department could give students a place to practice different styles of teaching skills. Furthermore, a preparatory department could help the pedagogy programs to generate money. In many of the

programs, the teaching assistants were the faculty members who taught in the preparatory program and also generated money for the programs. However, some subjects were reluctant to establish or expand preparatory programs. One concern was that a preparatory program would cause conflicts with local community piano teachers; another concern was lack of space for a program to run; others stated that it was not possible to include all types of students and lessons for pedagogy students' teaching practice in a preparatory program. For this situation, some subjects suggested that a preparatory program could also link with other community music programs, such as an early childhood music program, or an adult piano class to expand the types of teacher training. Therefore, a growing program may wish to establish a preparatory program, but, other alternative approaches like associating with community music schools, local piano instructors and a lab program may also be considered for teacher training purposes.

In terms of degrees offered in the selected 20 institutions, the choices spanned the entire spectrum. Differing philosophies and focuses may have been reasons for the degree variety, as was also found in Uszler and Larimer (1984). For instance, if a program considered that undergraduates should focus on establishing solid playing skills first, a performance degree with supplemental pedagogy courses could be appropriate. On the other hand, not everyone would continue to study through the masters or doctoral level. With this rationale, an institution which primarily offered a bachelors degree and a masters degree could consider offering a pedagogy degree or a combined performance and pedagogy degree at the undergraduate level. Furthermore, to support the idea of a flexible degree, as was also suggested by Uszler and Larimer (1986), colleges could provide an open degree through a music education program which could allow students to structure their own programs to suit their interests.

In addition to the typical undergraduate pedagogy degrees, a broad pedagogy degree was proposed by some subjects. A general pedagogy degree with a specialized instrument track could offer general topics, such as fundamental learning theory, educational psychology, supervision, and research techniques for all types of pedagogy majors to take as lower level courses. After students completed the general courses, then they could continue on to their own specialized instrument path of piano, string, or vocal. As a result, all the pedagogy students could have a more complete educational training on the music educational side and piano pedagogy professors could efficiently teach the topics that were truly their areas of expertise. Therefore, a school which offers different pedagogy degrees may wish to consider offering a general pedagogy degree or courses to recruit diverse pedagogy students. Furthermore, a general pedagogy program may wish to consider collaborating with the music education division's faculty members to offer broad educational courses as lower level courses.

At the graduate level, the finding that there were multiple piano pedagogy degrees highlighted the flexibility and individuality of programs. This finding was in alignment with Uszler and Larimer (1986) and NASM (2002) that stated the need for a diverse student population at the graduate level. The current study's results showed that performance degrees with some sort of cognate or an emphasis, some joint degrees in performance and pedagogy, or degrees through music education departments were common degrees. However, other options were that a school may offer a double degree provided for someone who could receive a masters degree in performance and add extra required credit hours to receive a second masters in piano pedagogy, or a second masters degree in piano pedagogy, combined with a DMA in piano performance as other flexible degree options.

As far as the research-based question as to whether the subjects would support offering a combined piano performance and pedagogy degree (Alexander, 1992; Charoenwongse, 1999) or separate degrees (Uszler & Larimer 1984, 1986) in their ideal programs, the results showed that for many, their ideal degrees were very similar to the degrees that their programs already offered. The commonality was that the degrees should balance the training of performance and pedagogy knowledge. Therefore, a curriculum which has balance on both sides may be the first priority for a growing program to develop.

In general, at the undergraduate level, most subjects supported the idea that students should focus on establishing performance ability, as was also suggested by Charoenwongse (1999). Therefore, based on this rationale, a straight performance or a performance degree with pedagogy course work may be the ideal scenario for a growing piano pedagogy program offering a bachelors degree. At the masters level, a majority of the subjects recommended a combined degree because a combined piano performance and pedagogy degree would allow students to continue developing and maintaining performance skills while also beginning a heavy focus on pedagogy training.

A few of the subjects debated the advantages of a separate degree for different circumstances at the masters degree level. The subjects advocated that a separate degree could serve to attract students who had already earned a masters degree in performance and would want a second degree in pedagogy without pursuing a doctoral degree. Also, for someone who had already established strong performance skills and needed more pedagogy training, a separate degree would be appropriate. Therefore, a separate degree could be directed toward a student's individual needs.

At the doctoral level, the results showed that offering a combined degree or a separate degree was debatable. A combined degree could present a balanced education in the curriculum, however some leaders felt that a combined degree may require too strong a focus on performance. This would take pianists away from concentrating on pedagogy issues. It may be important for institutions to formulate their philosophy of pedagogy before they can decide on the correct curricular path for their institution.

When asked about the best degree for a pedagogy instructor's qualifications, the leaders stated that a doctoral degree with a balanced education background and extensive teaching experience was essential to university pedagogy positions. This result was in agreement with Shook (1993), who found that a pedagogy instructor's training in performance skill, pedagogical training, educational knowledge, research skill or other special areas which could be related to piano teaching should all be considered in terms of a future piano pedagogy instructor's qualifications.

Comparing the size of pedagogy programs across the top 20 schools, the general range of enrolled pedagogy students was between 5 and 10. Generally, the numbers of graduate students were more than the numbers of undergraduate students unless the programs only offered a pedagogy degree at the bachelors level. Most selected programs only had one instructor to handle the entire program. Having one pedagogy instructor at a school was a change from past research where Chronister (1988) showed that pedagogy courses were mainly taught by performance faculty, and Uszler and Larimer (1984), found that some schools had no full-time pedagogy faculty.

Results concerning finances showed that the majority of programs had no specific budget and the programs had to rely on the universities' general funds. Approaches suggested by

subjects to improve a pedagogy program's finances were having a well-established preparatory program, finding endowments and grants, or obtaining community or music business assistance. A growing program may wish to consider using these approaches to enhance financial resources.

In investigating the largest challenges faced by the 20 programs, the fundamental issues were lack of money, as Lyman (1991) found, and faculty acquisition, as was also noted by Uszler and Larimer (1984). Having more money was the most common, pressing challenge that most subjects wanted to improve urgently. In addition, hiring more pedagogy instructors to improve teacher training, and offering diverse curriculum content options were also issues that subjects desired to improve immediately.

In describing the ideal piano pedagogy program, the results found that most subjects envisioned future ideal programs that provided sufficient teacher training and diverse curriculum content, which was in alignment with Holland's (1997) statement that a growing program should have a diverse curriculum for preparing a student for the professional world, and for meeting a learner's needs (Obied, 1998). In addition, having more faculty members and up-dated facilities were also issues that many subjects wished to have in their ideal program. Therefore, developing piano pedagogy programs may wish to consider: (1) collaborating with other divisions' faculty members for developing a diverse curriculum, (2) providing multiple types of teacher training through varied settings, (3) offering knowledge that is highly pertinent to students' future careers, (4) continually adjusting topics in the curriculum so as to meet students' individual needs, and (5) utilizing all the possible resources to establish up-to-date facilities.

The chief obstacles that kept most subjects' dreams from coming true were a lack of money, a lack of resources, and time limits within a degree. As Holmes (1992) found, a lack of

money can prevent an ideal school from occurring. In addition to resources, time constraints within a degree can prevent a program from offering a comprehensive training for students.

Some possible solutions suggested by the subjects can provide a growing program with ideas on how to overcome obstacles. To overcome a money shortage, finding a major donor who is particularly devoted to a pedagogy program, developing a preparatory program to generate money, or establishing partnerships with local music industries may help to improve the situation. In terms of increasing resources, it may be beneficial to align a program's mission with the university's mission in order to encourage the administration and piano faculty to support the program's needs. Also, placing piano pedagogues in leadership positions to raise the awareness of the importance of a pedagogy program, and helping pedagogy students to find university teaching positions may also lead toward increased resources. To overcome the issues of time constraints in a degree, workshops, conferences, and seminars could help students to gain more experiences within a limited time of study.

Future Research

The main focus of this study centered on the perceptions of the top 20 university piano pedagogy programs, not on nationwide perceptions. It should be noted that a small, accessible group of piano pedagogues chose the top 20 university piano pedagogy programs based on their perception of the quality and reputation of the programs. Clearly, this could be interpreted as an imperfect process, but since this study is one of the first to attempt to measure piano pedagogy leaders, and since there is no published list documenting program strength issues, this process can stand as a model of an early effort to gather information. That withstanding, generalizations based on this study's findings should not be made to other programs.

Continued research is needed in the area of pedagogy. Since many of the topics and issues regarding program status or leader opinion have not been discussed in the previous research, there is a need for continuing research in this area. Therefore, the following recommendations are suggested for future research:

For research on programs, there have been two studies that have investigated piano degree plans, one for piano performance majors' degree plans and one for the requirements of piano pedagogy curricula for piano performance majors, but there is a need for a study investigating piano pedagogy majors' degree plans. Hence, in order to understand more completely pedagogy requirements and degrees at the undergraduate and graduate levels nationwide, a research investigation of piano pedagogy majors' degree plans nationwide is highly recommended.

The results of the current study showed that teacher training programs were an important component of piano pedagogy programs. Most of the interviewed program leaders felt positive about their strong teacher training offerings for their pedagogy students. Many selected programs had their own preparatory programs for student teaching practice and financial aid. However, this study only focused on the preparatory program in terms of the pedagogy program. There is a need for research investigating how to establish a successful preparatory program, and the obstacles that can be faced when starting a new preparatory program. Therefore, a study that focuses on this area is suggested for future piano pedagogy research.

Most subjects stated that strong support from a variety of people was crucial to a successful pedagogy program. However, some subjects felt a lack of support from music administrators, piano performance professors, and music educators. Therefore, a future study

investigating music administrators', piano performance professors', and music educators' attitudes toward piano pedagogy is strongly recommended.

In the current study, results concerning status and opinions of interviewed subjects can serve as a model and reference for growing piano pedagogy programs. Recommendations for future research studies in the piano pedagogy field may help to improve future university piano pedagogy programs through further investigation of pivotal topics in the area of piano pedagogy.

APPENDIX A

LIST FOR THE 20 UNIVERSITY NAMES

Arizona State University
Bowling Green State University
Capital University
Cincinnati Conservatory of Music
University of Colorado at Boulder
Florida State University
University of Illinois
Louisiana State University
University of Minnesota
University of North Texas
Northwestern University
Ohio University
Ohio State University
University of Oklahoma
University of South Carolina
Southern Methodist University
University of Texas at Austin
Texas Christian University
Westminster Choir College
Wichita State University

APPENDIX B

THE PARTICIPANTS OF NATIONAL GROUP PIANO AND
PIANO PEDAGOGY FORUM OF 2002

Auler, Robert
 Cincinnati College-Conservatory of Music
 Beckman, Brad
 University of North Texas
 Beckman, Linda L.
 John Brown University
 Benson, Cynthia
 Bowling Green State University
 Benson, Michael
 The Ohio State University-Lima
 Berenson, Gail
 Ohio University
 Beres, Karen
 North Carolina School of the Arts
 Betts, Steve
 Southern Nazarene University
 Bosits, Marcia
 Northwestern University
 Brown, Helen
 William Jewell College
 Carnes, Sandra
 Malone College
 Chen, Tushan
 University of Minnesota
 Christensen, Linda
 Wayne State College
 Cockey, Linda
 Salisbury University
 Conda, Muchelle
 Cincinnati College-Conservatory of Music
 Cooperstock, Andrew
 The University of Colorado at Boulder
 Cremaschi, Alejandro
 Ohio University
 Dobrea-Grindahl, Mary
 Baldwin-Wallace College Conservatory of Music
 Etchegoyen, Gaston
 Michigan State University
 Fast, Barbara
 University of Oklahoma
 Frazier, Ivan
 University of Georgia
 Garcia, Susanna
 University of Louisiana at Lafayette
 Gipson, Ann
 N/A

Graning, Gary Alan
 University of Akron
 Grausam, Becky
 University of South Carolina
 Hahn, Christopher
 University of Oklahoma
 Herris, Keith
 Goshen College
 Hilley, Martha
 The University of Texas at Austin
 Hisey, Andrew
 Oberlin College Conservatory of Music
 Holland, Samuel, S
 Southern Methodist University, Meadows Schools of the Arts
 Huang, Grace
 University of Minnesota
 Johnson, Amy E.
 Grand Valley State University
 Johnson, Rebecca
 Community Music School, Capital University
 Johnson, Stephanie
 Cincinnati College-Conservatory of Music
 Johnson, Victoria
 Louisiana State University
 Johnson, Tracey
 William Jewell College
 Shimpo, Ryoji
 Baldwin-Wallace College-Conservatory of Music
 Shockley, Rebecca P.
 University of Minnesota School of Music
 Shook, Timothy
 Southwestern College in Winfield, KS.
 Sprague, Glenna M.
 Oakton Community College
 Steffan, Andrea
 Oberlin Conservatory of Music
 Sturm, Connie Arrau
 West Virginia University
 Awenson, Thomas
 North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University
 Taylor, Melanie Foster
 Converse College
 Thio, Alex
 Cincinnati College-Conservatory of Music
 Trivette, Joseph
 Southwest Virginia Community College

Vogt, Christy
University of Miami
Winston, Kathy
University of Texas –Austin
Zdechlik, Lisa
University of Arizona
Zigler, Amy
Belmont University

APPENDIX C

EMAIL LETTER FOR THE RECOMMENDERS

Dear: _____

My name is Camille Fu, and I am a Ph.D. Candidate in Music Education at the University of North Texas. The reason I am emailing you is to ask for your assistance with my doctoral research project "A Status and Vision Investigation of US University Piano Pedagogy Programs."

For my research study, I need to interview leaders of university piano pedagogy programs and ask them to describe the status of their current piano pedagogy program and the vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy program.

To obtain the list of universities offering piano pedagogy programs with excellent reputations, I am inviting a group of people who teach piano courses in universities and are active in the piano pedagogy field to provide the list. For this task, I have chosen the participants of the National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum of 2002 to recommend the list. As a participant, your information was obtained through the National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum website and your email address was obtained through your university website or music department. Therefore, I would like to invite you to recommend the top 20 university piano pedagogy programs that you believe to have the best reputation across the nation.

For your reference and convenience, I have attached a list of institutions offering piano pedagogy programs provided by the Proceedings of 1991 Directory of Piano Pedagogy Conference, but this list is only for reference because the information was not updated and not completed. You can recommend university names which are not on the list. Please recommend the top 20 US university piano pedagogy programs and email the university names back to me at your convenience by February 15th 2005.

In addition to emailing you this letter, I am sending you another copy through the mail. I will enclose a consent form for you to sign and a self-addressed stamped envelope. You can recommend the 20 university names either through email or mail along with the consent form. In addition to recommending the list of 20 university names, please provide me your professional information, including your school, and your teaching position.

Once again, I thank you for your time and input to this study. Your assistance is very important and will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Camille Fu
xxxxx@xxxx.com
Ph.D. Candidate in Music Education at the University of North Texas

APPENDIX D

DIRECTORY OF PIANO PEDAGOGY OFFERINGS IN

AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

(Provided by the Proceedings of the 1991 National Conference on Piano Pedagogy)

ALABAMA

Auburn University
Birmingham-Southern College
Huntington College
Judson College
Samford University
University of Alabama
University of Montevallo

ARIZONA

Arizona State University
Northern Arizona University

CALIFORNIA

California State University at Chico
California State University at Dominguez Hills
California State University at Fullerton
California State University at Long Beach
California State University at Los Angeles
California State University at Northridge
California State University at Stanislaus
College of Notre Dame
Holy Names College
San Diego State University
San Francisco State University
University of Southern California
University of The Pacific

COLORADO

Colorado State University
University of Colorado at Boulder

FLORIDA

Florida State University
University of Central Florida
University of Miami
University of Tampa
University of South Florida

GEORGIA

Armstrong State College
Columbus College
Georgia State University
Shorter College
University of Georgia
West Georgia College

HAWAII

University of Hawaii

IDAHO

Boise State University
Lionel Hampton School of Music

ILLINOIS

American Conservatory of Music
Augustana College
Chicago Musical College of Roosevelt University
Eastern Illinois University
Illinois State University
Illinois Wesleyan University
Northern Illinois University
Northwestern University
Southern Illinois University
University of Illinois
Western Illinois University

INDIANA

Butler University
Goshen College
Taylor University

IOWA

Central College
Drake University
University of Northern Iowa

KANSAS

Kansas State University
Pittsburg State University
University of Kansas
Wichita State University

KENTUCKY

Eastern Kentucky University
Northern Kentucky University
Southern Baptist Technological Seminary
University of Louisville

LOUISIANA

Centenary College
Louisiana College
Louisiana State University
Loyola University
Mcneese State University
University of Southwestern Louisiana
Xa Vier University of Louisiana

MARYLAND

Peabody Institute of the John Hopkins University
Towson State University

MICHIGAN

Andrews University
Michigan State University
University of Michigan

MINNESOTA

Augsburg College
College of ST. Catherine
Northwestern College
Southwest State University
ST. Cloud State University
University of Minnesota
University of ST. Thomas

MISSISSIPPI

Belhaven College
Jackson State University
Mississippi State University
William Carey College

MISSOURI

Central Methodist College
Central Missouri State University
Missouri Western State College
Northeast Missouri State University
Saint Louis Conservatory
School of the Ozarks
Southeast Missouri State University
University of Missouri-Columbia
University of Missouri-Kansas City
Washington University

MONTANA

Eastern Montana College
Montana State University
University of Montana

NEBRASKA

Hastings College
University of Nebraska

NEW HAMPSHIRE

University of New Hampshire

NEW JERSEY

Rutgers University
Trenton State College
Westminster Choir College

NEW MEXICO

Eastern New Mexico University
New Mexico State University

NEW YORK

Eastman Schools of Music
Ithaca College
Nazareth College
State University of New York at Potsdam

NORTH CAROLINA

Appalachian State University
East Carolina University
Meredith College
Queens College
Salem College
University of North Carolina at Wilmington

NORTH DAKOTA

Valley City State University

OHIO

Bowling Green State University
Capital University
Heidelberg College
Kent State University
Mount Union College
Oberlin College
Ohio Northern University
Ohio State University
Ohio University
University of Toledo
Wright State University

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma Baptist University
Oklahoma City University
Oklahoma State University
Phillips University
Southwestern Oklahoma State University
University of Central Oklahoma
University of Oklahoma

OREGON

Marylhurst College
University of Oregon

PENNSYLVANIA

Carnegie Mellon University
Millersville University
Pennsylvania State University
Philadelphia College of Bible
Susquehanna University
West Chester University

SOUTH CAROLINA

Bob Jones University
Coker College
University of Charleston
Columbia College
Converse College
Furman University
University of South Carolina

SOUTH DAKOTA

Augustana College
Northern State University
South Dakota State University
University of South Dakota

TENNESSEE

Austin Peay State University
Belmont University
Carson-Newman College
University of Tennessee
Maryville College
Memphis State University
Southern College of Seventh-Day Adventists
Tennessee State University
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
University of Tennessee at Martin

TEXAS

Baylor University
East Texas State University
Midwestern State University
Sam Houston State University
Southern Methodist University
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Southwest Texas State University
Texas Christian University
University of Houston
University of North Texas
University of Texas at Arlington
University of Texas at Austin
University of Texas at El Paso
University of Texas at San Antonio

UTAH

Brigham Young University
University of Utah
Utah State University

VERMONT

University of Vermont

VIRGINIA

Longwood College
Norfolk State University
Radford University
Shenandoah University
Sweet Briar College

WASHINGTON D. C.

Catholic University of America

WASHINGTON

Pacific Lutheran University
Seattle Pacific University
University of Washington
Washington State University
Whitworth College

WEST VIRGINIA

Marshall University
University of West Virginia

WISCONSIN

Carthage College
La Wrence University
University of Wisconsin

APPENDIX E

EMAIL LETTER TO LEADERS OF THE 20 TOP PIANO PEDAGOGY PROGRAMS

Dear _____

My name is Camille Fu, and I am a Ph.D. Candidate in Music Education at the University of North Texas. The reason I am writing this letter to you is to ask for your assistance with my doctoral research project “A Status and Vision Investigation of US University Piano Pedagogy Programs”.

Purposes of the study are to determine: (1) the status of piano pedagogy programs, (2) the vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy programs, and (3) the obstacles and possible solutions of establishing an ideal piano pedagogy. This knowledge could help piano departments establish solid pedagogy programs and procedures.

To investigate the research questions in the current study, I contacted piano pedagogues who were participants of the National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum of 2002 to recommend their opinion of the best 20 piano pedagogy programs.

I am happy to inform you that your program was selected as one of the top 20 pedagogy programs, and therefore, I would like to invite you to be interviewed about your pedagogy program. The interview will be conducted over the telephone. I will present you with the 12 interview questions first and set up a time to interview you. The interview session will take approximately 30 minutes to complete and will be recorded on audiotape. After the interview, I will write out your statements and have you check them for accuracy. The audiotapes will be kept confidential, and will only be used for the purposes of this study. While the list of 20 outstanding pedagogy programs will be listed as a result of the study, your personal name will not be associated in any way with the results of this study, and individual comments and quotes will not be linked to any school or person. Should you decide not to participate in this study, your school will still be listed as one of the top 20 pedagogy programs in the US in my dissertation.

In addition to emailing you this letter, I will be sending you another copy through the mail. I will enclose a copy of the 12 interview questions, the consent form, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. If you agree to participate in this study, please sign the consent form, provide a list of convenient times for an interview and return the information to me. I will then email you to confirm an interview time. You can contact me through mail or email at the contact information listed below.

Your opinions will be very valuable and important for improving the future of university piano pedagogy programs. I really appreciate your input and assistance to this research. I look forward to talking to you soon.

Sincerely,

Camille Fu
xxxxx@xxxxx.com
Ph.D. Candidate in Music Education at the University of North Texas

APPENDIX F

CONSENT FORM FOR THE 29 PIANO PEDAGOGUES

University of North Texas
Research Consent Form

Title of Study

A Status and Vision Investigation of US University Piano Pedagogy Programs

Principal Investigator Hui-Ju Camille Fu

Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the purpose and benefits of the study and how it will be conducted.

Study Procedures

The purposes of the study are to investigate the status of piano pedagogy programs, the vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy programs, and the obstacles and possible solutions of establishing an ideal piano pedagogy from the viewpoint of leaders of university piano pedagogy programs. This knowledge could help piano departments establish solid pedagogy programs and procedures.

As a past participant of the National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum of 2002, your expertise is needed to identify leaders in the pedagogy field. Therefore, you are being asked to recommend who you believe to be the top 20 piano pedagogy programs with the best reputation. After collecting the list of recommended universities, the 20 universities with the highest rankings will be chosen and the leaders of the 20 piano pedagogy programs will be designated as the subjects for this study. Your participation in this study will be limited to your email or mail response listing the top 20 piano pedagogy programs. There are no foreseeable risks to your participation in this study. If you sense any discomfort with the task, you can decide to not participate in the study without any negative consequences. Your personal name will not be linked to any content in this study.

Review for the Protection of Participants

This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-3940 or sbourns@unt.edu with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

Research Subject's Rights

I have read or have had read to me all of the above.

The researcher has explained the study to me and answered all of my questions. I have been told the risks and/or discomforts as well as the possible benefits of the study.

I understand that I do not have to take part in this study and my refusal to participate or my decision to withdraw will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop my participation at any time.

In case I have any questions about the study, I have been told I can contact Camille Fu at xxx-xxx-xxxx or Dr. Debbie Rohwer, my Faculty Advisor in the Department of Music Education, at 940-369-7538.

I understand my rights as a research subject and I voluntarily consent to participate in this study. I understand what the study is about, how the study is conducted, and why it is being performed. I have been told I will receive a signed copy of this consent form.

Signature of Subject

Date

APPENDIX G

CONSENT FORM FOR 20 PIANO PEDAGOGY PROGRAMS' LEADERS

University of North Texas

Research Consent Form

Title of Study

A Status and Vision Investigation of US University Piano Pedagogy Programs

Principal Investigator Hui-Ju Camille Fu

Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the purpose and benefits of the study and how it will be conducted.

Study Procedures

The purposes of the study are to investigate the status of piano pedagogy programs, the vision of an ideal future piano pedagogy programs, and the obstacles and possible solutions of establishing an ideal piano pedagogy from the viewpoint of leaders of university piano pedagogy programs. This knowledge could help piano departments establish solid pedagogy programs and procedures.

To investigate the research questions in the current study, I contacted piano pedagogues who were participants of the National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum of 2002 to recommend their opinion of the best 20 piano pedagogy programs.

Your program was selected as one of the top 20 pedagogy programs, and therefore, I would like to invite you to be interviewed about your pedagogy program. The interview will be conducted over the telephone. I will present you with the 12 interview questions and set up a time to interview you. The interview session will take approximately 30 minutes to complete and will be recorded on audiotape. After the interview, I will write out your statements and have you check them for accuracy. The audiotapes will be kept confidential, and will only be used for the purposes of this study. While the list of 20 outstanding pedagogy programs will be listed as a result of the study, your personal name will not be associated in any way with the results of this study, and individual comments and quotes will not be linked to any school or person. Should you decide not to participate in this study, your school will still be listed as one of the top 20 pedagogy programs in the US in my dissertation.

Review for the Protection of Participants

This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-3940 or sbourns@unt.edu with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

Research Subject's Rights

I have read or have had read to me all of the above.

The researcher has explained the study to me and answered all of my questions. I have been told the risks and/or discomforts as well as the possible benefits of the study.

I understand that I do not have to take part in this study and my refusal to participate or my decision to withdraw will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop my participation at any time.

In case I have any questions about the study, I have been told I can contact Camille Fu at xxx-xxx-xxxx or Dr. Debbie Rohwer, my Faculty Advisor in the Department of Music Education, at 940-369-7538.

I understand my rights as a research subject and I voluntarily consent to participate in this study. I understand what the study is about, how the study is conducted, and why it is being performed. I have been told I will receive a signed copy of this consent form.

Signature of Subject

Date

APPENDIX H
TRANSCRIPT MARKINGS

- // Interruption of current speak by next speaker.
- [Speakers begin simultaneously.
- = Latching; no interval between the end of a prior piece and start of a next piece of talk.
- (N.n) Elapsed time without talk, in tenth of seconds.
- (.) Micropause (less than 5 seconds).
- (hhh) Audible breathing.
- A 'cut-off' of a prior word or sound.
- ::: A drawing out of sound.

Text is written as heard, not according to grammatical convention.

Punctuation makers are used as phrasing and intonation, not according to grammatical convention.

Italicized comments were sung, and not spoken; utterances spoken over singing are marked with an asterisk.

Stressed words and word portions are italicized.

APPENDIX I
20 SUBJECTS INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS

Interview with Subject A

R: Thank you for your interview today, (Subject A)

S: You're welcome.

R: And I'd like to let you know that your school has been selected as one of the top 20 university piano pedagogy programs in this country by a group of people.

S: *Fabulous*.

R: First I'd like to ask you what you think are the characteristics that made *people* choose your school as the best one.

S: [There are *several* things that I think *help* with that. The group piano, GP3, national group piano pedagogy forum, has been *held* here three times, so quite a few people have been able to see our *facilities*, and our facilities are *fabulous*. So I think one of the things that helped us is the setup of our group piano situation and our pedagogy *library*. What we *have* are two piano laboratories that are divided by a *viewing* room, and in that viewing room you can actually, there's TV cameras set up so you can *watch* what's going on, in both teaching studios and *record it*, either on DVD or on VHS. There's also computers set up in there so that I can *type* what's going on in there and assess the teaching situation. So the *assessment* setup is excellent. The piano pedagogy *library* is also housed in that room and it's *quite* an extensive library. And we developed a cataloging program to put the library, so we know exactly what we have. And it's all *in house* so you don't have to go to a different library. So I think the facilities and the *excellence* of the facilities, helps. We also have (.) document cameras, they're called, where you can just put a piece of paper under the camera and you can view it on the *screen*, we have projectors mounted in the ceiling. And we have an internet hookup on that and DVD so you can see whatever you want, *plus* we have *laptops* in both of our group piano rooms.

R: It's a very advanced facility.

S: *Very* advanced facility.

R: And all of the students get a chance to use that and learn how to do that.

S: Yes.

R: And you think that the conventions make, help the school's reputation...

S: //Very much, because the convention was able to *showcase* the facilities. So the *facilities* are number one. (.) Another reason that I believe we're one of the top 20, *our students*, (.) are not only *musically* excellent, but they're *intelligent*, and they're fine *teachers*. So, although the conservatory has a lot of pianists, only a certain number are interested in teaching. And so, when those certain number filter over me, then I have the best of *teachers* and the best of *performers* and the best of *intelligence*.

S: So I'm very fortunate with that. And *then* I think the third reason we would have been named in the top 20, is my personal (.) *visibility* in the field, the fact that I'm on the executive board of GP3, (.) I'm the head of the adult learning committee for the national conference in keyboard pedagogy, and I do a lot of *things* for MTNA. So my visibility, and giving *presentations*, oh, and the *keyboard companion*. So, I think my visibility helps somewhat.

R: Yes, every aspect helps.

S: So, those are the three things.

R: Thank you. Could you talk about the curriculum in your program at the undergraduate level and the graduate level?

S: //Sure. (.) Right off the top, I just want to *tell* you that it's a very big honor to be chosen as one of the top 20 because we *don't* have a pedagogy degree. Which is really *remarkable* if you

think about, you know, a pedagogy school without a pedagogy degree. The undergraduate curriculum only includes one year of *required* pedagogy. I could say that's good, I could say it's bad. For us, it's *perfect*, because our undergraduates are performance majors and their mind is *definitely* not in the area of teaching. (.) So, to *force* them into that sort of idea (.) wouldn't be wise. And to change the (.) format of the undergraduate performance criteria to allow pedagogy majors would not fit with the school. So our undergraduate, we *don't* have a major in pedagogy. So we have a one year piano pedagogy curriculum, and in that we go through the typical, (.) learning how to teach beginners, intermediate, *and* group. They do a whole quarter, we're on the quarter system so they have three sets of classes. They also get the opportunity to teach private students, and those private students, they teach... I teach the student, they watch me, then they teach them on their own. Then the next quarter they teach in *front* of me, and I observe *every* lesson and evaluate. And then the next quarter, they take over the student themselves. So in other words, I *gently* release the student to their responsibility.

R: Right, generally they become independent.

S: //Yes. (.) The graduate curriculum is somewhat *different*. On the *doctoral* level, we have what is called a '*cognate*' in piano pedagogy which means, have to choose a minor. And it's the minor in piano pedagogy that is my (.) *absolute*::: I started it, and it's just excelling like *crazy*. That's a *two year* curriculum, where they take a graduate piano pedagogy course where they also do the same thing; they *observe*, they *teach*, they learn about materials, (.) they learn about leveling materials, they do research. And that's just a basic pedagogy course. *But* the second year, we have, of the *cognate* in pedagogy, we have what's called a *seminar* in piano pedagogy. (.) *That's* the course where, first of all, they *research* the field of pedagogy, that's where they actually don't learn how to write dissertations, but how to write pedagogy articles and give workshops, how to, what are the hot points in pedagogy, and if you were working at a school and someone says, (.) "I don't think that people can learn as adults," how they would come up with the information and be able to discuss things maturely. (.) They also learn how to do powerpoint presentations, how to write articles. And out of those articles, my graduate students, I think *four* of them have been published just in the last two years, with *Clavier*, with *American Music Teacher*, and with *Keyboard Companion*. =So they're getting out their publications, which is important. =And they also have what's called '*supervised teaching*,' as part of that curriculum. In supervised teaching we fill in the *gaps*. Sometimes my graduate students have been teaching children, but they have never taught adults. So I'll put them in an adult class. Maybe they've taught one on one, but have never taught a group. So it's *very* independent, the supervised teaching. =And, in that supervised teaching, they can supervise with me, but our *local* piano teachers are *also* willing to supervise them. And so, often I send them out to work with a *Suzuki* teacher, (.) or a *kindermusic* teacher, or a *group piano* teacher for children. The Baldwin piano education program and Rachel Kramer from MTNA, they go out and work with her program all the time. So we're lucky to have a very supportive community.

R: And this is just for a performance major.

S: Yes.

R: Wow, this is like a pedagogy major.

S: Well, you see that's the thing. Our school is unique in the fact that it's a performance school, but if you think of the title. The emphasis has always been on the college part, it's an *academic* school. Pedagogy cognate is academic, which is supported by the administration.

R: So is it going to have a pedagogy degree in the future?

S: Well, (.) I noticed one of your questions was, “In an ideal world how could I improve, what would be improved?” With *only* me, in a school that large, doing all the pedagogy, *and* I’m in charge of all the secondary piano, (.) I can’t do it on my own. It would be *wonderful* to have a pedagogy doctorate. (N.n) The only two issues that at the conservatory, are the fact that *it* is a conservatory, (.) but if we had another person, *ideally* it would be great to even strengthen the pedagogy on the masters level. It’s the masters level I feel we’re not strong enough. On the doctoral level I have 9 of them; I hand *pick* them for their *teaching* ability. (.) They’ve already been accepted for performance ability, =so they’ve been prescreened there. So I have *fine* performers who are teaching for me, but *obviously* they’re interested in teaching. They quite often are the ones that work with me in pedagogy. And so far they’ve had a *hundred* percent placement in jobs, teaching positions at universities.

R: That is *excellent*.

S: So, like I said, at the *doctoral* level we’re very strong. Ideally, we’d have another person. I think that pedagogy programs, secondary piano pedagogy, are often *tremendously* understaffed.

R: So, how do your students practice their teaching, in private settings or in group settings?

S: Both. Which program do you want me to talk about?

R: *Both*.

S: Well, because I’m the *head* of the secondary piano program, then I can *grab* as many students as I *want* to get their permission to be taught by a “student teacher.”(.) So we have all kinds of college-aged students that work one on one with my pedagogy students. And like I said, they work with *me* in conjunction, and then I gradually let them loose. So they’re doing, they *all* have to teach a private student. *Every spring*, they *all* have to work with me in a group class.

R: So are you talking about the undergraduate, or graduate now?

S: Both. (.) And then step *farther* than that are the graduate students that I try to fill in the *gaps* of their learning. And those gaps are filled in through area teachers and through our preparatory division. *Ideally*, you work hand in hand with the prep division. But, that’s the other *wish*, is that we could *streamline* that, working with the preparatory division.

R: So in that division, it’s all young students, right? And your students teach them in group and in private, too, right?

S: My pedagogy students only work with the *college-aged* students.

R: So, don’t they work with young students?

S: *Until* (.) they take their supervised teaching course, and when they *do* that, they work with *area teachers* and their young children.

S: =And I have area people that supervise, yes.

R: That’s excellent, so they get different experiences through different situations.

S: And to be honest, it’s *safer* (.) to work with the college-aged students, because they are old enough to give *permission* to be taught by a student teacher, where a youngster, it’s problematic because, (N.n) you know, (.) the college-aged students are able to give their permission, children it’s more *problematic* as far as *legality* is concerned.

R: Thank you. So now I’d like to talk about the piano pedagogy *instructors*. In your opinion, what do you think is the best degree for teaching pedagogy courses?

S: Wow. (N.n) And you’re asking someone that’s at a *conservatory*, so that makes it even *harder*.

R: //Well, just in your own opinion, because I need everyone’s different opinions.

S: Well my opinion has changed, *tremendously*, (.) through the last few years because of being at the conservatory. The field of piano pedagogy is *deep*, (.) and *wide*. And (.) somebody that

has a DMA doesn't necessarily *know* about the field of *pedagogy* like my graduate students taking their pedagogy *cognate* area. So, I (.) have a problem with just somebody that has their doctorate in piano teaching *pedagogy*. Could I give you a for instance?

R: Please.

S: I've had people call me that said, "I got my DMA five years ago, but I never met you," or no, they say, "I didn't take your courses. I've been offered this job so-and-so, at such-and-such a place and they want me to teach pedagogy. What *book* should I use?" Well that's *ridiculous*, if you *don't* know what book to use, or how to even *research* what book to use, well then what are you doing teaching that course? It's sort of like somebody that's a *dentist* trying to do a *heart* operation. You have to be *trained* in the field. So if it's a DMA, and in my case it's a DMA with a *cognate* in pedagogy, I think that's pretty much an *ideal* situation because they've got the *performance and* (.) the pedagogy. Now, I have a Ph.D. in piano pedagogy, which is *fabulous* and I feel totally *blessed* because I had such good training. But I also have two *performance* degrees. I have a problem (.) with people who go straight pedagogy without developing their *performance*. Because that makes us look like, or makes me feel like in pedagogy we can only work with beginners or intermediate students. And we really have a *responsibility* to know our field, the whole *depth* of our field. So people can choose to *specialize*, but if you're teaching pedagogy, you should be familiar with the *whole* depth. So I really think, probably the ideal situation is a DMA with a *minor* or a *cognate* in piano pedagogy or a *secondary* learning area of pedagogy.

R: So you mean pedagogy has to be somewhere, attached to the degree.

S: Yes, and it should be *equal*. Performance and pedagogy should be equal footing. I really believe that. Now, my Ph.D., because of the way it was done, I could have gone DMA but I went Ph.D. instead. My teacher, focused on the performance just as much as the pedagogy. So I was fortunate; I gave recitals. I know that a lot of people are not going to respect you as a university professor unless you can play. So if you're going to teach piano, you should be able to play.

R: Thank you. Can you tell me about the finance in your program, please?

S: OK, (.) that's a *hard* question to answer because we don't have a *budget*, so to speak. I have a certain amount of money and I believe it's \$500, set aside for repairs and set aside for pedagogy things I may need, supplies, for a year. And that's ridiculously low. It doesn't get much except, it might repair a few headphones, or that sort of thing, or buy a couple pairs of headphones. *However*, the way the university has set it up is excellent, and let me tell you what they did. (N.n) Students are now paying a *technology* fee. Now, in past years, technology fees went to computer labs, however, group piano. Electronic pianos, visualizers, all the equipment I use in my class are *fee* equipment. So I am *able* to harness on to that funding to replace my lab and to keep things up to date. (.) I also apply for a lot of grants and (.) funding to do things, technology wise.

S: Technology budget is a first come first serve, and luckily, like you know, I first come *a lot*. (.) I ask for money in a straight up way, right up front and I've been very lucky for that.

R: //So the school is very supportive.

S: //Yes, we have a very supportive school, but I don't have a *budget*.

R: Just whatever you need, you apply, and they support you, right?

S: //As much as they can. Sometimes I have to wait a year; that's all right. *Especially* if you're working with the *prep department*, and your budget comes from how many students you teach in

the prep department, then there the budget is... But we are not *tied* to a prep department, so I *don't* have a budget.

R: So you talk about fees going to technology, could you discuss the technology used in your program?

S: Well, I'm gonna work from one room to another. We use the document cameras *daily*, because we use them for *sight reading*. We don't, we try to stay away from illegal copying as much as possible, and so we're able to, by using a document camera, put music (.) up on a projector for the whole room to see on a big screen, and the students can sight read. So we use the document camera *daily*. We use, of course, the piano lab daily, using all the equipment and the headphones with that. We use the *visualizers*, are you familiar with visualizers?

R: No, not really.

S: A visualizer is a big, (.) like, a box, that when you play the piano the keys *shine up*, or the staff shines up so they know what you're *playing*. So we use that every class period (.) so that the students know what we're doing. We're starting to incorporate our *laptops*, and the laptops I use to do music, some of the music theory things, like with Music Ace. (.) Then we also use the computer *disks* that go with the books, because we have disk drives in our computers and we play the accompaniment. In our *viewing room*, we have the videos; it's a *TV studio*. So, in that TV studio, I'm able to watch the different rooms and make *comments* on the performance of the teacher, so I'm able to observe them. And my teachers are able to record, because there's cameras, two cameras mounted in both of the classrooms, so that they can set up the cameras and *watch* what they did. And they use them for training tapes and they use them to send out for job interviews. So that equipment gets used *daily*. (.) The library equipment is used daily to see what we have in our library, to go on the computer on that. And then we also have a *floating* camera that we use in our teaching. We have two rooms with two grand pianos and we have cameras in there that are moveable so that students can record their private teaching, not just group teaching.

R: (N.n) You seem to have *a lot* of knowledge about technology. How do you get all this information?

S: I think, really *truly*, that's *one* of the reasons we're on the top 20, is because I'm really up on the technology. You know, (.) I *never* was afraid of it. My big way that I do it is I have a *dream*, and I said, "Boy it would be nice to walk around the classroom without these *plugs* interfering with me," and so then I started searching up to see if there's a reality. (.) Plus, I am a strong *believer* in looking for the people who are experts and getting their support. We have, *on staff*, an IT guy that fixes all my headphones. See, you talked about the budget, we have someone that that's part of his job, taking care of any electrical problems. We have someone, also, who is *hired* on staff to take care of our computer issues, so I contact those two for information. When we built our new building, which we did right before I came to here, right after I came to here, we called a man with Yamaha Corporation. They came here; I told them my dream, they *told* me how to do it. They told our *IT* people how to do it. So I think, quite often you can get what you want technology-wise, if you just, don't be afraid of saying what your dream is, and trust someone else to help you with your reality. (.) And I'm *not* afraid of it.

R: Thank you. So, we have talked about *finance*, instructors, curriculum, and technology funds. Which one is the largest challenge in your program?

S: My *biggest* challenge is there's one of me. (.) I wish, I:: I often feel like I'm *cheating* my students because I'm *not* able to *watch* them teach as much as I'd like to watch. I *wish* I had somebody else on staff that could *go* around and *offer* criticism, *advice* on how to teach.

Because I can *not* be sitting with these people 24/7. And that's the biggest challenge, *is* (.) having enough one on one time with my pedagogy people.

R: So, is there any position going to open for having someone to help you out?

S: (N.n) Unless we start a *masters* in pedagogy. If there's a *masters* in pedagogy, then we would have to hire another person. With the *economy* right now, it's on *hold*, but it's *something* to look for the future.

R: (n) So we talked about the *status* of your program, now I'd like to know about the *vision* of your idealized piano pedagogy program. So, in your dream, what type of an ideal program would you see?

S: (.) My ideal pedagogy program would be very similar to what I have now, *except* (.) the teaching component. I *really* believe the ideal program should have pedagogy students working with the advanced students and the applied faculty, and getting *corrections* from them. Well, *not* just corrections, I'm talking about *constructive* criticism on their teaching. So I think that they need *high* level teaching with high level students. (.) And to work hand in hand with the *applied* faculty with that, not just pedagogy faculty. My ideal program would have *somebody* for *each* specialty area for them to work with. I'm a group piano specialist; I'm an adult specialist. So they have me. (.) But to have somebody that's a specialist in teaching kindermusic, or Suzuki, that they could work *very carefully* and hand in hand with. *That* would be the ideal pedagogy program.

R: So you're very close.

S: I *need* help. I need other people that are specialists.

R: So what are the *obstacles* would you see?

S: *Money* is always an obstacle. You can't *afford* to hire people. I am fortunate that the local piano teachers are *willing* to supervise my teachers, and to do it for *free*. But ideally we should be paying them, (.) and we should have someone onsite. Now, I am fortunate because my graduate students are able to go to their studios. Our undergraduate students, we can *not* require them to go off campus, which is why the undergraduate school can only work with my college students, because I can't require them to *go* anywhere. So ideally, someone would *come* onboard and work with my undergraduates on the teaching.

R: So, for the obstacles, would you see any *possible* solution for these?

S: //Yes I *do*. The solution will be: (.) when our preparatory division is making big changes right now, and they're looking at getting specialists *in* on piano, a kindermusic specialist, a Suzuki specialist, and a group piano specialist for children. I mean, they're working *towards*, and maybe even a Yamaha, using a Yamaha connection. (.) When they *have* these things on board there, we will (.) work *hand* in hand with them. So I can see the solution *there*, with our preparatory division. (.) *However*, the obstacle for that is: if they are mentoring my pedagogy students, they really should be *compensated* for that. So *money*, again, is the obstacle. A *solution* for that could be, perhaps, (.) is to get somebody to endow it. Get somebody to give money towards it, you know, somebody that cares about the *arts* and cares about teaching *children*, to give money towards a pedagogy program. *That* would be a solution.

R: A grant, you mean::

S: //I'm talking about individual *donors*. I think a donor would be ideal. And sees the value of a *good* teacher, and that they would endow money towards teaching.

R: Thank you, and so my last question is: some research has supported that we should have a separate degree from piano performance and pedagogy degree, and some of the research has

shown that we should combine. In *your* opinion, what's the *best* idealized degree for the pedagogy students?

S: (N.n) Well:: it's interesting asking me this year, and not *10* years ago. I, (N.n) I'll tell you. I think that there's room for *both*. I can't say that one is better than the other, I think it *depends* on what school, (.) what you're going to do, what school you're going to teach at when you're done. For instance, a pedagogy, I have a pedagogy doctorate, and it has been ideal for what I do, so I can say, and (school) is where I went and it's a fabulous pedagogy program. It was *great*. (.) So that's a pedagogy degree. (.) *Luckily*, I could perform, and I had the opportunities to perform. I think that *any* pedagogy degree without a performance aspect is not going to be to the *benefit* of the teacher. So, if it's a *pedagogy* degree, which is cool, it's fine, that's an ideal, it has to have a *strong* performance component. (N.) On the doctoral level, I'm talking on the doctoral level. Now on a pedagogy *masters*, maybe more of a, (.) less of a performance degree and more of a teaching degree, and *that* would be ideal on the masters level, *heavier* on the pedagogy. That would be nice.

R: Now could you be...

S: //I didn't answer your question (hhh).

R: More *specific*.

S: I *know*, I know, you *want* me to choose.

R: If you are going to offer a title in your ideal program, what kind of title would you offer for this degree? Ph.D.? DMA? Or pedagogy Ph.D. and DMA?

S: I think, (N.) *DMA* in performance and pedagogy.

R: For all the three different levels? (.) masters, doctorate?

S: No, just *doctorate*. OK, so doctorate would be a DMA in pedagogy and performance, I'm going to put *pedagogy* first. DMA in pedagogy and performance. MM in pedagogy, and a bachelors, no pedagogy degree on bachelors. A bachelors degree, either a performance degree or a music education degree.

R: Sorry to make you to choose:::

S: //I understand. I like my choices. They're good.

R: *Great*, thank you so much.

S: You're welcome.

Interview with Subject B

R: Hi, (subject B), I'm *glad* to let you know your program has been selected as one of the top 20 university piano pedagogy programs in the country by a group of people.

S: //Thank you. It's a very big honor.

R: Yes. Before we start on the status of your program, can you think about, or *imagine* about what were the *characteristics* that made people choose your program as one of the top 20s?

S: I think that a piano pedagogy program *has* got to have an *outstanding* piano performance aspect to it, in other words there has to be an extremely *strong* piano faculty who can direct the further development of piano skills. There has to be *very strong* piano pedagogy faculty. So *you* have that, and also the curriculum is intelligently put together. Students are going to be getting the *two sides* of the education they need to get.

R: (.) So you think that's the thing that makes your school *unique*?

S: *Yes*, because in *so many* pedagogy programs there's maybe a very outstanding piano pedagogy person *there*, or they have a strong piano pedagogy tradition, but then when you *really* investigate the piano faculty that your students will be studying with, it's *not* as outstanding as other schools. I mean, it can go the other way also. For instance, the piano faculty is just *wonderful* but the piano *pedagogy* area is not as strong. So I think it's very *unusual* when you can find a school in which both areas are equally, really, *really* strong. And we are really strong in *both* these areas. We have several new piano faculty members. One of the young artist competition winners is from my school and we think he's got a *terrific* chance of winning, so the piano performance area is very strong. He's also one of my graduate assistants in group piano.

R: Congratulations.

S: So I've got these *wonderful* pianists who are working with me, too, so I'm thrilled.

R: Thank you. And because your program is so strong, I would like to know about the curriculum at the undergraduate level and the graduate level. Can you talk about that?

S: Yes. Um, (.) we have, we do have a *bachelor* of music in piano pedagogy, and then we have a certificate. We have a *masters* of music in piano pedagogy, we have a masters of music *education* in pedagogy, and we have a *Ph.D.* in music education with a piano pedagogy emphasis. Now the bachelors degree is, (.) there are separate courses for the undergraduate students. My pedagogy students who are undergraduates, meet along with piano *performance* students who have two courses in piano pedagogy required of them also, so these folks are just learning pedagogy for the *first* time. You know, principles of teaching, this whole *world* is just sort of new to them, they've never heard *any* of this before. And the curriculum is quite, (.) it's *amazing*. On the undergraduate level, about only *one* out of every 10 students who audition for the program, are admitted just on the basis of their piano audition, because it is a piano performance degree, *also*. And they play a *recital*. And it is very *difficult* to get it. So they take four courses in piano pedagogy, and then they take a practicum, which is like an internship, of course, and then they have to write a research project. It's *larger* than a term paper, but not as large as a *thesis*. (.) And I'm *directing* all of this and handling all of this, so it's a lot of work.

R: A lot of work.

S: Yes, it's a lot of work, and I get to know the students very *well*. And on the graduate level, almost all of my piano pedagogy students also have *teaching assistantships*. *Many* of them are working, teaching in the group piano, class piano program as some people call it. (.) They also, I give them many more assignments in terms of starting to develop curricula, and just being a little

bit more into leadership roles. In addition, working with me, I'll have them come in and evaluate materials that I'm writing, and things like that. But they have *four courses* that are piano pedagogy courses, two per year. And then they also have a practicum and they also have a research project. (N.n) They have to give a *lecture recital*, 45 minutes of playing, minimum, and then a lecture that I prepare with them. And then the Ph.D. students, the curriculum is very, very, very open because music education is kind of in charge of that, (.) but I direct the students. But most of these folks go on and get jobs heading up large university group piano programs. I give them *a lot* of responsibility with the program. So they're a huge *help* to me, but they also do a lot of things that looks *very good* on their resume and gives them *a lot* of experience. And they have to write a dissertation.

R: A lot of process.

S: Yes, a very long process, as you know.

R: Yes.

S: *Lots* of work.

R: So, you know, in the pedagogy program, how do your students get teacher training experiences? Through course work, or internships?

S: //Right, the *internship*. I've got to say, up until two years ago, I had a wonderful situation where I had, *in* my home, a lab school with a hundred and twenty students. I had four teaching studios, a computer lab, a group piano lab. I had a very *big* house.

R: //That's unique.

S: Very unique. Actually, (another school) had a similar situation in their home, too, and we were the only programs in the country to have this type of arrangement. I *closed* my studio two years ago, but it was with the understanding with a couple of my former graduate students who had *very large* professional commercial studios, that we would then be able to join forces and work with their students and do *whatever* needed to be done in terms of teacher training. So my students do a *tremendous* amount at the beginning of observing teachers at whatever level is appropriate for the course. They do much *peer*-teaching in the class, during which, of course, they're not really working with students but they can work out a lot of the *snags* in their presentation style and the other students can comment on it. "Oh, that doesn't work," or "that was very boring," or something, so we work out a lot of things like that. (.) Then, they actually, of course, begin in small, *very small* segments of time, working with actual students. So it takes a while before I actually will say, "*OK*, now you can have two students of your own." They're observed very carefully. I observe two students a week from every single one of my students; I *watch* their lessons. That's one of the most time consuming things for me.

R: Do you see any differences between the graduate and undergraduate..?

S: Oh yeah, *oh yeah*, and *mostly* because graduate students have had experience teaching students. I mean it really comes down to *experience*. And, you know, course work is one thing; you can learn all of these wonderful things in your courses, but if you have never *actually* sat down and tried to teach a young, a seven year old who is spinning around on the bench, it's just a new world. So it's very, very, very important to have a lot of practical experiences.

R: Right, so for the training, you offer that training in courses, or you have separate courses for that?

S: Well, for example, on the undergraduate level there are actually *observation* courses. So, these guys are *just* freshman and sophomores. They think they want to major in piano pedagogy. Some of them don't even know what it *really* is. So they have to go and observe in the community, (.) 28 lessons, and they have a particular observation form. And then they have to

observe in *college* studios. We have periodic meetings, and so on. As they get a little bit further *advanced* in their undergraduate degree, they observe and they also help one or two of the teachers in the *community*. They might substitute for them when they go out of town. (N.n) On the graduate level, they do other kinds of things, they present master classes to groups of students, they do *a lot* more group teaching. But, you know, you have to have better teaching skills to do group teaching. You really do, because then you have the extra element of organization; *keeping* all of these students interested, besides relating the material.

R: It's a different skill.

S: //Very different skill.

R: Thank you. (.) So, we talked about, from the student aspect, now I'd like to know about your opinion about instructors. What kind of degree do you think is best for those university pedagogy instructors and why?

S: Oh, (N.n) well that's a very, *very* interesting question. And I'm rather *conflicted* about it. I'll be very honest about that. (.) My thinking changes periodically. I think that it's very, *very* important:: I'm not sure the *degree* is the thing, (.) if the person has studied piano, plays well, continues to play, has studied with *a lot* of different teachers and has *a lot* of experiences themselves. (N.) You know, I'm not sure that the DMA or the Ph.D. is "the thing." I think that the Ph.D. person who spent a year working in Europe with *so-and-so* and has played concerts *everywhere* and it just so happens they have a *Ph.D.* Or it could be a DMA who finishes and *never* ever practices another day in their life. They play their last recital and they go, "Ah, that's it, I'm never playing *again*."

R: Yes.

S: //So I'm not sure that's the difference but I think you'll find as you talk to people, that most people will say, that the *DMA* is the:: (N.n) I just don't think it's the *actual* degree that you get that makes the difference.

R: Right. It's the person, the people.

S: [It's what you do with your life, not the label that's on at the end of your name.

R: Sure. (.) Since you have addressed the instructors' issues, now I'd like to know about the technology used *in* your program.

S: *All right*, technology used in my program. (N.n) Well, the piano lab, of course, we have the pianos interfaced with Macintosh computers. We do a lot of sequencing, you know, *recording*. I am not a big technology buff, but this is on my wish list of things I *want* to have, (.) is a really *great* technology person on staff with me. I work with the contemporary media person on our faculty and he does a lot of demonstrations *for* us and so on. We *do* a lot with prerecorded MIDI-disks. We have little assignments in class where they will record short segments and create their own MIDI-disks. I'm not a big... I mean, you're going to talk to some other people who *love* technology and I wish I did, but I think there's only *so* many things that we can do and be really *great* at, and that's not mine. (.) But I also believe it is very *important*, (.) especially in the future. We're going to be teaching on the *internet* – well, we already are – we can teach, we can sit here and teach a student in China, *right now*.

R: That's amazing.

S: //We better know about it.

R: Thank you. So, money is always the issue. How does the budget distribute in your program?

S: (N.n) Well, I think that that's going to *vary* from school to school and from year to year. We have got a *really, really* wonderful dean right now, who is so *strongly* supporting piano pedagogy. This is his first year. And he is saying, "You know, *whatever* you need, tell me.

Write it down, we're going to make it happen." So, there is, as far as buying the new piano lab, there is a new student fee that I think every student in our college of music (we have 1100 students) all *have to* pay and I'm not sure what the amount is. But it seems like it's \$75 a year or something close. (.) This is the second year we've had that, or maybe the first. We can use that and purchase things--instructional things that our huge group of students in the college of music are going to benefit from. So I said, (.) "You know, we really need another piano lab that's really up-to-date," and the dean said, "OK, let's use the student fees."

R: That's nice, very supportive.

S: Wonderful for the students::: So, you know, it has to be something *directly* beneficial for the students. Other than that we just have budget things that come down through the regular budget, nothing special.

R: That's good.

S: Yes, I know, we are very, very lucky; my school is very lucky.

R: You know that's probably one of the reasons that makes your program so strong.

S: *Yes*, and having the administrative support, yes.

R: Thank you. So we talked about finances, instructors, curriculum, technology. Do you think, if you had to say, what is the most challenging thing in your program?

S: Most challenging thing is, we are seeing, (.) and I will be very honest, (.) we are seeing a big change in demographics. Our school has a *huge* number of international students. We have folks from Bulgaria, and folks from everywhere, everywhere. And so there is sometimes the *language* problem. I've told some of my Korean graduate students, "You know, I can't even imagine taking an oral comprehensive exam in Korea. It just *terrifies* me. I couldn't even *envision* it. (.) But yet you come over here and you spend two years here and you do a wonderful job doing this. And you do all this *writing*. I think it's a very *interesting* challenge, but what I'm finding that I'm needing to do is I'm having to change *my focus* a little bit. (.) Because folks who are coming from different countries have very different expectations and backgrounds and so I've been having to try to be really *sensitive* to my students and say, "What do they *really* need?" I also say, "What do I *know* that they need," but then also, "what do they *feel* that they need?" So that's been a challenge. (.) In the past there has been a challenge with getting the full support of all the piano faculty for the piano pedagogy program but I think that is in the past now. And everything is turning around, and piano pedagogy is respected, yes, that's the direction we need to really be going in. (.) Piano performers need to be piano pedagogues. So that has been a challenge in the past but it's not a challenge right now.

R: It's *changing*.

S: //It's changing. Change can be *very* good. Change isn't good sometimes, but the change is *very good* now.

R: So through all the things, if you could improve one challenge, which one would you choose to change, improve immediately, right away.

S: Of those that I mentioned? (.) I would like to be able to somehow, *magically* be able to be the best teacher for all of these different students' needs. It used to be that (.) the students were more needing the same thing, needing to hear the same thing, and now it seems like it's much *more* diverse. (.) I just wish that I could clone myself, and direct some and say, "OK, now you're going to go over here and help these folks who need, really need a lot of practical work, and you're going to help these other people who need a lot of work on their writing." (N.n) It's very challenging and I wish I could do it better, but it's kind of impossible.

R: You are very ambitious, I can tell.

S: Well, I know, I need more help. But everybody *does*. Everybody needs help.

R: Thank you. So, you gave me the status of your program. Now I'd like to know about your personal opinion about your vision of the idealized piano pedagogy program. If you could build up your own ideal pedagogy program, what kind of picture would you envision?

S: *Oh* goodness, there would definitely be a *large* lab school. It would be *extremely* diverse, it would cover *all* ages, *all* levels. (.) You would have your traditional aged students, you would have the more advanced students that are getting ready for college auditions, you would have your adult classes and you would have senior citizen classes. So your pedagogy students would always have a *tremendous* base for observing and teaching, and starting their projects and doing dissertations, I mean, *all* these possibilities. You see, that takes *facilities, money, staffs*. I love having my students play lecture recitals. I'd like for them to do *more* of that. One of the things that has been more exciting, *is* that, the lecture recitals at my school::: we're trying to *encourage* our students to use media and be very creative, because I think that might be some of the direction that performance is going in on the piano, in general. So, one of my students this year did a program on Spanish music and she brought in an actual Spanish dancer who demonstrated traditional dances of Spain prior to playing her pieces. It was *fabulous*. Of course there was a PowerPoint presentation. (.) I would like to see, maybe, I would like to see undergraduates somehow attempting to do kind of a small version of that, because I think that it's so appealing and it makes piano performance so *alive* for people. (.) And *plus*, people get experience. That's similar to what you have to do at MTNA when you come to do a session. At MTNA, you talk, and you have a presentation, so that's similar to what these students are doing. I like to have people do things that they're going to have to *really* and *truly* do in their real life(.) I'd like to have them do a *master class*. I'd have them do different kinds of *judging* in the community, working under the direction of some people who are experienced. So I think that with *all* of these experiences, you just need to write them all down and think, (.) "What are all things you've done in your life professionally that your students need to learn how to do?"

R: That's a *big* picture.

S: Yeah. It would take people a *long time* to do it, but you said ideal.

R: Yes, yes. Hypothetically.

S: //So perhaps people would *never* graduate!

R: So, do you see, in your vision, do you see any *obstacles* when you try to establish your idealized program?

S: Oh, sure, yes, like the *lab school* situation, for example. We could never likely do that. (.) We have our building problems regarding available room, we have... It also would take such an *incredible* staff to do something like that. I was telling you that there is a lot of support from the piano faculty in my school, so I think we'll gradually have some of these things change, (.) and these recitals. *More* lecture recitals. Maybe the workshops and other things if I can figure out how to do it in the curriculum without making it just too much for the students. Sometimes you just make it too long. Our students already, (.) for the MM have to be here *two* complete years. So for some people that's *longer* than a lot of other schools.

R: Do you see any *possible* solutions for the obstacles?

S: Possible solutions. (N.n) Well, I think that, if you have a doctoral degree that you can *do* a lot of these things, and we have the Ph.D. program and there are many requirements in music psychology and other music education courses. So I think the *DMA* or the *DM* program we are looking at very seriously. And then I think it will be very possible to *implement* a lot of these things. So I think with further degrees that you can do more of this, there's more of an umbrella.

But I think that people need to realistically say, “What do people *really* need to be able to do to function professionally and to improve the profession, and be a *great* representative so that when they leave here and have a doctorate in piano pedagogy, what do they need in order to be able to go out and be a leader in your country, or your state, or your city. Also it is important to be involved in professional organizations. I want our graduates to be very aware of *journals*, professional organizations and all of those things. (.) To be a *good* piano professional.

R: So you mean a higher degree, (.) like a *DMA* would be a solution?

S: I think it is a good way to go, and then just also continuing to say that your education is *never* over. When you leave here, that’s just the beginning. You know, you *keep* going, and the moment you quit growing, you quit going. I don’t know, that’s not good.

R: It’s a long process.

S: *Very* very. Right. You keep developing throughout your life.

R: Right, life is a long-term learning process. (.) So, as you know, much research has debated whether performance and pedagogy should combine as one degree or should offer separate degrees. In your idea program, what would you offer and why?

S: (N.n) I really, (.) *really* like the idea of having it as a joint degree, *equally*, saying that there’s *equal* importance between the areas. It’s *very* important that one not be considered less than the other. (.) I know one school has a similar degree to that that I am describing. I think that it’s a really good *model* that I would like to follow when we propose, (.) when we work on our program structure. I think that when the students come, they have to really be able to play. For many reasons. They’re just going to be better teachers, they’re also going to, (.) let’s be realistic, they’ve got to get jobs. They’re going to go out on auditions, they’re going to be competing against people who don’t have pedagogy degrees but who have spent eight hours a day in the practice room and they’ve only had *five* hours a day to spend in the practice room. (.) So, you have to really, *really* make that a very *strong* requirement. (N.n) People have to come in with very excellent playing *skills* and a very good background. (.) And then, the piano pedagogy part has to be equally important and it has to be very respected because it is *excellent*.

R: So what kind of title would you offer to this kind of degree?

S: A *DM* or a *DMA* in piano, what should we say, let’s see, (.) I’m a bit biased, because I would say, a *DM* or a *DMA* in piano performance and pedagogy, or, well, I don’t really think it makes a big difference what *order* you put the words in. You can swap the words, depending on... That’s such a small thing, you know, it really *doesn’t* matter, but it might matter to the people on the search committee or the dean, (.) but you know, it really doesn’t matter. But when it somehow says that one is less significant than the other, a *very* bad message is being sent.

R: That’s right. So how about for bachelors and masters?

S: OK, I think this is my personal philosophy, and I just stated this last week. We do presently have a bachelor of music in piano pedagogy. (.) I, quite frankly, think that I would love to see all students get more straight forward bachelor degrees; for example, a *straight* piano performance bachelors degree. So that they can really, really, *really* concentrate on piano performance, and also, of course, take a couple courses in piano pedagogy. (.) Or, if they choose, they can get a degree in music education, and then they can specialize on their masters degree or on the doctoral level. I mean, that’s just a personal philosophy. On the masters level, I love it that we have a master of music emphasis, that there’s actually a piano performance, piano pedagogy emphasis. *Performance and pedagogy are equal*. We have a master of music education piano pedagogy emphasis, (.) that has *no* recital requirement. So with those folks (.) I say, you really need to play a recital. Even if it’s a half recital, you *really* need to do this. And you really need

to take the keyboard literature courses, even though they *aren't* required of you. And I know that my, (.) people are shocked to hear me say that I don't think a bachelor of music in piano pedagogy is necessarily a wonderful thing, (.) I think we could probably live without it as long as folks have good courses in piano pedagogy at the graduate level.

R: Thank you so much. This was very wonderful information for me, too.

Interview with Subject C

R: (Subject C), thank you for your interview today. I would like to let you know that your school's piano pedagogy program was selected as one of the *top 20* university pedagogy programs in the United States by a group of piano pedagogues. Now I would like you to think about what kind of characteristics make your program so strong?

S: I think there will probably be *two* reasons, and one is that we *do* have a faculty member and a previous faculty member, so two of them, who are very strong *leaders* in pedagogy, and they have really strong *personalities* and they have really good ideas, and they are the ones who started the pedagogy program here, and I think it's *due* to those two people. Another thing is that our curriculum is *never static*, that we're always *changing to reflect* whatever new trends in pedagogy there *are*, and so we're a *dynamic* pedagogy program, I would say.

R: That's nice, so how big is your program?

S: (N.n) The pedagogy program, I couldn't tell you *exactly* the numbers, off hand, but I would say we probably have six or seven graduate students in pedagogy, (.) or maybe even up to *twelve*. And this is just piano pedagogy. (.) In the undergraduate program, (.) there may be fewer.

R: Do you have a doctoral degree for pedagogy?

S: *Yes* we do, we have both a *masters* and a *DMA*.

R: That's very nice. So you consider that the faculty and a dynamic program are two things that make your program so *strong*?

S: *Yes*.

R: Could you please talk about the curriculum content in your program at both the undergraduate and the graduate level, please?

S: Well we have... (.) One of the things I think that is really *good* about our undergraduate pedagogy program, (.) well really about both of them, is that we *require* the piano, the pedagogy students to also be *performance* students, so they take a *lot* of performance oriented classes in both the undergraduate and graduate levels, (.) as well as, then, classes in pedagogy. The curriculum, *especially* the one that I'm in charge of, is very *practical* oriented, in other words, they don't just read about the theory of teaching, they *actually* teach, and so, they get *lots* of experience in actual classroom teaching.

R: So, sorry, what do you mean, (.) how do they actually teach?

S: Well, (.) in the, there are two pedagogy programs here, there's the piano *preparatory*, which is teaching the students how to teach individual lessons to *younger* students as well as *group lessons*, and then there is the *group* pedagogy, which is what I'm in charge of, and that's actually for mostly, *graduate* students. (.) The piano prep program, there is *actually* a group of students from the community who *pay* to belong to the program, and then the students, the *pedagogy* students themselves, will teach them under the direction of the piano prep professor.

R: I see, so they get their teaching experience from the prep program, right?

S: [Yes, as well as *taking* classes, and then with *me*, (.) most of the people who *take* my group pedagogy class are my *teaching assistants*, and they teach the class piano classes *for* me. So they take the class as well as *teach* for me, and they usually do that in their very first year, or semester of teaching. So they're always getting class experience.

R: Right, so, they are mainly *graduate* students, right?

S: Yes, in the *group* pedagogy program. It's *not* really a program, but it's *a course*.

R: I see. Is it a little bit like an internship program?

S: Well, (.) we *call* it a graduate teaching assistantship, and that's what they get. They get a *stipend* for it, (.) the group piano teachers and students. And then they teach about, let's see, (.) they teach *four* times a week, so that's *two* classes that meet twice a week, and they have office hours, and then we have a teaching assistant meeting where we go over lesson plans, and so forth.

R: I see, so could you talk about the curriculum for the undergraduates? How many credits are they *required* to take?

S: I'm going to have to look that one up, because I don't really, that's the one, those are the questions that are better answered by another faculty. But, I'll try, I'm looking it up here. (N.n) There's, uh, (N.n) looks like there is a keyboard harmony course, which is what I teach, a repertoire course, and a performance pedagogy materials course, so that's a total of *five* undergraduate in pedagogy classes.

R: And how about the graduate level? Masters, and doctoral?

S: I'll look that one up, too. So (N.n) about the same, five or so. So that's for the masters. And let's see about DMA. (N.n) It doesn't really say, exactly, (.) but it's probably the *same* kind of classes as the masters degree requires.

R: So you have a *DMA* degree in piano pedagogy, right?

S: *Yes*.

R: So, (.) you talked about the teaching assistants at the graduate level, but how do the undergraduates get teaching experience? (.) Through the class?

S: Undergraduates? (.) Sometimes the undergraduates are given piano *prep* students.

R: So they also teach in the prep program?

S: Sometimes, you know, when they get to be at the *upper* class grade level.

R: So do they teach in both the individual setting and in the group class?

S: Yes, I think so, (.) but mostly I think that the undergraduate students probably also have *private* students of *their own*, and they're *asked* in their pedagogy classes to *detail* some of their experiences as a private teacher, and then they get *advice* and *information* from that class that they can transfer to their private studios.

R: Yes, I understand; that's great. Now, I would like to know your opinion of pedagogy instructors' qualifications. (.) Which means, what kind of degree do you think is best for being a piano pedagogy instructor?

S: Well, our philosophy here, and I *agree* with it, is that a pedagogy student should also be a *performance* student, because we don't think those who can play, perform and those who can't play, teach. We *don't* think that. We think that people who teach should also be *able* to play. So, that's why we require them to be *both* performance and pedagogy for our major.

R: So the best is having both degrees?

S: *Yes*.

R: OK, thank you. So, I know your background has some *science* background, am I right?

S: *Yes*.

R: That's very interesting, when I looked at your background on the website, I thought, "That's *neat*, you have a very different view from other people's angles."

S: Well, (.) as a matter of fact, it was that background in science, actually, that *really* helped me to understand pedagogy. Because, the *same* is true in science, when you go to graduate school, you usually get a teaching assistantship so I have been teaching for many, *many* years, it's just that I haven't been teaching piano pedagogy for many, many years. But the *concept* of teaching is the *same*, I think, whether you're teaching science or whether you're teaching music, and then,

I've also been involved with a lot of *curriculum development*, and the *whole* philosophy behind curriculum development is very *similar* no matter what type of thing you're teaching, so, (.) I think it's been very helpful to have been *outside* of music, and to *bring* that view here.

R: That's very *unique* from many other piano pedagogues' backgrounds I've seen, that's very nice. (.) I'd like to know about your program's finances, how does the finance get distributed to your program, and how do you get that financial support?

S: (.) I'm not exactly sure if the piano *prep* program supports itself through its tuition revenues, but I am imagining that it supports itself to a *great* degree. Except that I do know that the music department provides two teaching assistantships for the piano prep program, and *five* teaching assistantships for the group piano program, so in *all*, in total, we have *seven* teaching assistantships that help fund the graduate students who are *in* the program, and that amounts to, it can be up to, let's see (.) I think our teaching assistantship is about \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year, depending on whether you're a masters student or a DMA student, and we *provide* that to them, and then we also give them out-of-state tuition wavers because that can be quite a *significant* amount of money, I think it's about \$11,000 a year for a graduate student, something like that. And then, (.) we have a budget from within the music department itself for our *equipment*. For example, I'm in the process of replacing one of my digital piano laboratories, and the money for that is going to come from the music department, and that will be about \$40,000.

R: Yes, yes, thank you. So you talked about digital pianos, how is technology used in your program? Can you describe it?

S: Well, (.) we have *two* classrooms that are set up with digital pianos, and right now, we have *Roland* electronic keyboards that are advanced enough so that they feel, you know, they have the touch of the piano and they have pedals and so forth, but they are electronic keyboards and they are all hooked up to a *master keyboard*, which is the instructor's keyboard. And so we use that kind of technology for our *group piano lessons*, and then we also have *MP200s* which give us different *sounds* and then we can also *record* things. (N.n) In my particular curriculum, I use the Martha Hilley *Piano for the Developing Musician* textbook, and there is a *website* which is *associated* with her textbook, and so we can use that as well. So we use *that*, and, often, (.) I ask my students in the class piano program to *compose*, and then they can go to a computer lab, we have a computer laboratory in the *music* department *just* for music students where they can access electronic keyboards attached to computers, and they can go there and they can compose, and they can use programs such as *Sibelius*, or something like that and print out their compositions and bring them to class, (.) so those are the ways in which we use technology.

R: Do you have certain *software* that you utilize for teaching particularly?

S: No, we *don't* have that yet.

R: OK, (.) so we've talked about curriculum, we've talked about teaching, teacher training and pedagogy instructors, finances, technology. Which one do you see as being the largest challenge you are facing in your program?

S: (N.) Well::: it's going to be a toss-up between *financing* and *technology*.

R: Why?

S: I'll say *technology*, the reason being is that, (.) well actually the two go hand in hand. Technology is expensive. And, we do have a nice budget, but it's not a *huge* budget, and so we can't really afford *all* the technology that we possibly could be using, and there's a *resistance* by some people, including myself, just because I can't spend 24 hours a day doing this job, to learning all of the latest technology and then applying it into the curriculum. So *probably* technology.

R: So if you could improve one challenge at a time, which one would you be most anxious to improve *immediately*?

S: Well, it is the *technology*, (.) and as a matter of fact, I'm trying to improve it by replacing the laboratory with *updated* technology, and that will happen by June 30th, as a matter of fact. We will have new keyboards and they will be *much* more up to date, and easier to use, and have more *features*, and so that one is actually being taken care of, (.) but we *do* have another lab that needs to be updated, so that would probably be my next challenge; to find the *money* and the *opportunity* to update our pianos.

R: Technology changes so quickly, you always have to *update*, right?

S: [Even so, we have had the same digital pianos for 10 to 15 years, and even though the technology has changed so much, we have been able to get by for a large number of years on what we had.

R: Thank you. So we've talked about the *status* of your program, it was very clear. (.) And now, I'm going to ask you about my second research question, which is your *personal* opinion of an idealized piano pedagogy program. In your mind, if you were going to build up an idealized program, what kind of picture would you dream about, and what would you like to happen?

S: (.) Hmm::; We're pretty *close* to the ideal, I think, in the sense that there is a *lot* of opportunity for our pedagogy students to have *real life* teaching experience. (.) I would say, it would be *more* ideal (.) if they could take pedagogy classes sometime in *advance* of teaching, because some of our students start a graduate pedagogy program *without* any previous teaching experience, and they start teaching in my group piano program *right away*. And they haven't taken *any* classes in pedagogy yet, because they've come from *somewhere* else, from another undergraduate degree. So that puts them at a disadvantage *right away* in our program. (.) It would be *nice* if they could take, (.) if our incoming students could take some pedagogy classes *first*, so they had some idea of what they're doing first, *before* they start teaching. (N.n) And then, the other ideal would be keeping more *up to date* with our technology, and that would be about it.

R: So in your vision, do you see any possible *obstacles* to your ideal program?

S: (.) It's practically *impossible* to bring in a new graduate student and *require* them to do as I want if they haven't had any teaching experience. *Because*, a lot of the time the only time they can come to graduate school is if they have some sort of *financial* aid, and most of our financial aid is in the form of *teaching assistantship*. So that is the *obstacle*.

R: Any possible solutions for this?

S: (N.n) I don't know whether this is a practical solution or not, but if we were to *require* people coming in to the pedagogy program in the graduate level to have *previous* pedagogy experience before they are allowed in our program, that would be a solution, but I don't know whether it's possible to *have* that as a prerequisite or not.

R: It's a hypothesis.

S: Yes.

R: The last one is that some research has shown that pedagogy and performance should combine together and merge as one degree. Some research has suggested that pedagogy should separate from performance degrees. In your ideal program, what is your philosophy about this issue and what kind of degree would you offer, and why?

S: Well, (.) as I had said before, we believe strongly that teachers ought to be able to perform, *too*, so we *advocate* combining performance and pedagogy. (N.n) You know that the problem is

that the pedagogy students have a *lot* of required courses and there's not a lot of room for *extra courses* or *extracurricular* things like electives.

R: Yes.

S: Not a lot of *room* for electives. But, on the other hand, once they're *through* with their degree, they really have a *lot* of experience in pedagogy and performance, and they're very *strong* in that, (.) so I really think that an idealized program would remain in *combining* performance and pedagogy in one degree.

R: So you think it should have a combined degree for bachelors, masters, and doctorate? All of them?

S: (N,n) *Yes*.

R: OK, thank you so much.

Interview with Subject D

R: (Subject D), thank you for your interview today, I'd like to let you know that your piano pedagogy program has been selected as one of the *top 20* piano pedagogy programs in the United States by a group of piano pedagogues. I would like for you to think about what sort of characteristics make your program so strong that it's been selected as one of the top.

S: Yes, I think it's known as a program that has a *comprehensive* piano pedagogy program, one that has both *majors* at the undergraduate level, the masters level, and then it's also possible for students to study at the *doctoral* level. That's not a *major*, but rather it would be either a DMA in performance or a Ph.D. in music ed with a *minor* or an emphasis in piano pedagogy. I think, also, *both* myself and a couple of my *predecessors* in this position have been quite active *nationally* at conferences and writings and things like that so there's some name *recognition* there. (.) And I think, also, this school is known as a strong *piano* program and a strong *music ed* program, and of course piano pedagogy is somewhere between those two areas.

R: So you think the strong *faculty* and the strong *curriculum* are the two major reasons, factors, that make your program so strong?

S: *Sure*.

R: Your program offers pedagogy degrees at the bachelors and the masters, right? And for the doctoral degree, it's for a DMA or a Ph.D. with a pedagogy emphasis?

S: Right, it would be a *major* in performance or music ed, but then with a pedagogy *minor*.

Because, often times students who are really *interested* in pedagogy, you know, that's their main area, they'll *come* here for a doctoral degree, it just won't be an *actual* degree in pedagogy.

R: I see, thank you. Since you've talked about your curriculum, could you please talk about the curriculum content at the undergraduate and at the graduate level in your program, please?

S: *Sure*, do you want me to tell you what courses they take for their degree, or more what is covered in the courses?

R: I think I want *everything*.

S: All right, (.) well the undergraduate degree, you know, basically, that's a bachelor in music degree and they take the *normal* selection of courses from piano and piano lit, and of course theory and music history and everything like that. In pedagogy, (.) they take a two semester piano pedagogy *sequence* and then, that hopefully happens either in their sophomore or junior year, and then the *following* year, they do two semesters of a teaching internship, in which, they're teaching *children*, *pre-college* students, and then they're observed and evaluated by *me*.

(.) So, really, in actuality, it doesn't differ much from the *performance* degree because the performers also take pedagogy; the only difference is the *two* semesters of internship. (N.n) At the masters level, the students take *four* semesters of pedagogy. Two of the semesters are the courses that the undergraduates also take; that's *cross-listed*. It's a 4000 level course, or like a senior-level course, but it also works for masters students. And then they also take the 7000 level graduate course sequence, which is two semesters. So four semesters all together.

R: So what kind of content does it cover?

S: [Sure, in that class that's both for undergraduate and masters students, I really feel like the focus of that should be (.) to *prepare* the students to teach *independently*, both children and adults, and private and group settings. (.) So we talk about *learning* theories, some of the ones that I believe are the most *accessible* to undergraduates. We develop a teaching *philosophy*, (.) spend quite a bit of time on teaching average-aged beginners, we talk about teaching strategies,

try them out. Of course look at methods and other materials. And then, a big *focus* of that class and their *practical* experience is taking part in a *demonstration* class. (N.n) Every week I teach a group of children, and then immediately following the group class, the pedagogy students teach a *private* lesson to the students. We also, (.) in that undergraduate class that the masters students also take, talk about teaching adult leisure students. We have a *unit*, independent studio management, and then, (.) also, primarily in the second semester of the course, address teaching *intermediate* levels. The *repertoire*, *teaching strategies*, they also observe *local* teachers teaching intermediate level students. So that's the two semester undergraduate/masters course.

R: How do they *observe* the local teachers' teaching?

S: How do I do that? (.) Well, I've become *acquainted* with the local chapter of the MTNA here, and I've gotten to *know*, (.)you know, from judging the students, going to recitals, and talking with the teachers who the really *strong* teachers are, and there are a lot of them here, and so, what I do is simply call or *e-mail* the teachers and ask if they're *willing* to have students observe them and then ask them to give times at which, you know, they're willing to be observed, and then have the *students* call or e-mail them a couple of weeks ahead of time to tell them when they will be coming to make sure that it's all right. (.) I think the last time I taught that course they did about eight observations and they had to see at least three different teachers.

R: That's excellent.

S: Let's see, (N.n) should I tell you about the content of the *graduate* level courses?

R: Yes, please.

S: (N.n) That's also a *two* semester sequence, and so that's *both* masters and doctoral students. And in both of these courses, I have lots of *performance* majors as well, which I think that is *really* important that we get the performance majors, to get them interested. The focus here, I still want to expose them to *pre-college* teaching, you know, independent teaching because I would hope that *lots* of the masters students will *pursue* that as a career. And then, additionally, *college-level* teaching because many of them are doing that right now through their *assistantships*, (.) and/or they have that as a career goal. One of the first things we do is address *career choices*; what are the different career paths that pianist teachers can follow. Obviously we talk about *college* jobs and the college job market, how to apply for *jobs*, you know, how to interview for jobs, what different college jobs entail. We also talk about *independent* studio teaching, *community* schools, music teaching preparatory division, teaching in all the different venues for teaching. Then they put together a *resumé*, and a *cover letter* and also, a video or a DVD of their teaching, the things that they'll need when they actually apply for a *job*. (.) And then, the next thing, which I feel is *really* important as we address the *fundamentals* of teaching and learning, students give *presentations* on educational philosophers and psychologists. And then, also, this year for the first time we read *Robert Duke*, from the University of Texas, his book called *Intelligent Music Teaching*, and had class discussions on that, and also used that as a way to evaluate *video tapes* of our own teaching, and I think that was really, really helpful, that students *read* and *learn* about the learning process and how that applies to teaching piano. (.) We also survey the *methods*, again, because lots of students at the graduate level haven't, *didn't* have piano pedagogy at the undergrad level. But there are different levels of assignments based on their *experience*. (.) Another unit is on teaching *college group* piano, in which they observe both me and my graduate assistants, we evaluate *textbooks*, develop teaching strategies, setting up a group piano program. (N.n) They write a *research* paper on a *topic* of their choice. So that's in the first semester. Second semester is basically, I call it *piano literature* for teaching. So we survey music from the four time periods, they learn how to level the literature using *Jane*

McGraw's system, they write a rhythm project on an area of interest in the literature, and then they also do *book reviews*, in which they, each week, look at a couple of books on *performance*, *piano pedagogy*, *music education*, to help them know what's out there, fill in gaps, explore areas of interest and things like that. And then, also, they *submit* tapes of their teaching, which I *evaluate* and meet with them about.

R: Excellent. So do you have any favorite textbook that you use for your teaching?

S: For the *graduate level*, definitely *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* is what I've used. I think that's really *good* for graduate students. (.) I think it's a little bit *too* deep and *philosophical* for undergrads sometimes. Like I mentioned, we also use the *Robert Duke, Intelligent Music Teaching*. For the second semester, the *Jane McGraw Guide to the Standard Teaching and Performance Repertoire*. (.) At the undergraduate level, I've used some different things. (.) I think my favorite is *Francis Clark's Questions and Answers*, actually, because I really like her *philosophy*, and (.) I think it provides a really good foundation for beginning teachers. I've also used other things, the new *Martha Baker-Jordan* textbook I used last year. (.) But I think the Francis Clark is probably my preference for undergrads, and then they also get the Jane McGraw text the second semester for literature.

R: Now I'd like to be more *specific* on the teacher training part. How do your students get teacher training experience, (.) like, how do they learn how to teach, in a private setting or in a group setting?

S: Well, (.) the undergraduate students, as I mentioned, take part in the *demonstration* class, so there, I'm teaching a group lesson every week. Eventually, they each teach a *segment or two* of the group class; they never get to the point of teaching the *whole* class, the undergraduates, but they *observe* it a lot and teach parts of it and assist. And then of course, they teach *private* lessons to one of the students in each of the groups. After they have *completed* that pedagogy course and the demo class, they can teach in the *preparatory* division if I say so; if they're interested. So many of them do that, then, in their junior and senior years. That is all *private* teaching. Some of them, also, teach in their own studios or at music stores, or programs through churches, or travel to students' homes. (N.n) Then, with the graduate students, many of them have *assistantships*, in which they're teaching college group piano, college secondary piano, and then really all of them are also teaching in the *preparatory* division, and some, (.) also, in their homes, and then with doctoral students, too, and the doctoral program here is *pretty* small. (.) The ones who are really *interested* in teaching pedagogy at the college level, I find a way for them to either *team-teach* the undergraduate pedagogy course with me, teach portions of it, or for instance, next year, one of my doctoral students, a Ph.D. student, will actually teach *one semester* of the undergraduate course. Let's see, (.) there's also, both at the undergraduate and the graduate levels, courses called *supervised* teaching, and undergraduate level; those focus on teaching young students, children. (.) Now at the graduate level, I use those to fill in whatever teaching gaps the students have. (.) If they don't have a group piano assistantship, I'll have them *assist* me, observe and then assist me in a group piano class. Or, if they're doing that through their assistantship, they might teach a *secondary* student through supervised teaching, or a child, or what have you. So, I really try to *tailor* their experiences, both in courses and outside too.

R: [For individual needs?

S: //Right.

R: OK, excellent. So how big is your pedagogy program?

S: We have, let's see, (N.n) it's a fairly small program I would say, the actual pedagogy program. One reason being that I am the only pedagogy faculty member. (.) At the

undergraduate level, I just have about *two* majors. (.) I, you know, I sort of believe that at the undergraduate level, it makes more sense to focus on *performance* and get a performance degree, with some pedagogy coursework, some experience, and then specialize more after. So I don't really *push* that undergrad pedagogy major much. And then the masters level, I have about *four* pedagogy majors. (.) And then at the doctoral level, I have *several* minors, (.) gosh, it's hard to say how many because half of them, they're either in residence or not.

R: Yes, it's hard to tell for the doctoral, I understand.

S: There are about, (.) oh, two, really just two currently who are really piano pedagogy focused as their main thing. (.) The others are performance DMA but *very* interested in teaching. So that's, about the size of it right now.

R: But it's already *big*, a lot for you to do, for one person to have built this.

S: *Exactly*, (.) and then in *addition* to the pedagogy majors, there's *always* a number of *performance* students who are very interested in teaching that need observation.

R: That's true, it's *a lot*. So, you have a prep program, right? Is it a big program?

S: It's *fairly* big, about, anywhere between 150 and 200 students.

R: That's a lot.

S: It is, and the *only*, (.) we primarily employ masters and doctoral students, sometimes juniors and seniors who have completed the pedagogy coursework. We have a *few* alumni in the program, but it's *mostly* current students.

R: So those students teach the prep program, right? Now that you've talked about the curriculum, now I'd like to ask you about your opinion of *qualifications* of being a piano pedagogy instructor. What kind of degree do you think is the best for *being* an instructor?

S: (.) You know, I don't think that *one* is better than another. And, a lot of it depends on what *kind* of school you're at. I'm at a large, state university that's very research focused, and I have a *Ph.D.* and that would probably be best in a position that requires real *scientific* research.

However, (.) I think in many schools, either a person with a DMA or a Ph.D. could do very well. And, (.) you know, I went to (school) for my doc., and in *many* ways, (.) the Ph.D. and DMA students at that time had a lot of the same experiences; they had the *same* coursework to a certain extent, and *lots* of the Ph.D. students did *recitals* and lots of the DMA students did *presentations*, and you know writings and things like that. You know, my friends, who did DMA, we did many of the same things. (.) So I think what's most *important* is that, regardless of the degree, that you have a *lot* of teaching experience at all different levels, and in both group and private environments and are really *knowledgeable* about the teaching and learning process and the literature, and certainly, as a *Ph.D.* (.) you need to keep your performance skills up. Because *obviously*, (.) that informs your teaching, but also more practically in terms of getting a *job*, (N.n) it can really win you the interview. Because on a search committee, oftentimes, that is made up *largely* of performance faculty, piano performance faculty.

R: So you don't think the degree?

S: [I don't think one is better than the other, you just need to have had a *lot* of piano pedagogy coursework, and you need to have had a *lot* of teaching experience and very *strong* performance.

R: It depends on what kind of *training* you have, right?

S: *Right*.

R: Thank you, now could you talk about finances in your program? How are finances distributed in your program?

S: Right, well, you know, (.) I *don't* have a piano pedagogy budget per se, but basically I've been *able* to get anything I need. Whether it's equipment, or repairs to the lab, or music benches,

or materials. (.) It either comes from the school of *music* or it comes from the keyboard area budget, or it's from the music education budget. I just sort of ask different people *for* different things, and I also, and this is probably a typical process of piano pedagogy professors for the piano pedagogy *library*, I write to *publishers* regularly to request new materials and things that we don't have.

R: Do you have particular *grants* for teaching assistants?

S: Grants? Let's see, you're talking about the teaching assistants, their stipends, is that what you're asking about?

R: Yes.

S: Well, (.) we have *four* group piano assistants and *two* preparatory division assistants, and the preparatory division funds those two assistantships and they range from about \$6000 to \$9000 a year. The group piano assistantships are funded by the school of music. Does that answer your question?

R: Yes, thank you. Now I'd like to know about the *technology* in your program, could you please describe it?

S: Sure, well of course we have a group piano lab, we have a Roland lab, a teacher console and visualizer, and sequencer, and disclavier and things like that. The pedagogy library, we have a number of computer stations with *software*. I had, (.) you know, very honestly technology is *not* my strongest suit or an area in which I'm really interested. Unfortunately, and I think it's, (.) but I should say that I think it's *very*, very important for today's pedagogy students, you know, especially those who are interested in college teaching, but also interested in independent teaching. I'm *lucky*, (.) however, that we have a really *terrific* music technology sequence offered by the *music ed* department, and that is *three* semesters long, and the *Ph.D.* students have to take that, and I've also encouraged some of the masters students to take that as well, (.) because the professor teaches all of that material, she is an *absolute* expert and teaches so *much* better than I could ever. (N,n) So, you know, I cover some piano pedagogy specific programs, software programs, and you know how an *independent* teacher can use technology as an asset to their studio. But the more hardcore stuff they get through the *music ed* department, even the *performance* majors can take that.

R: I see. So, do all of the students get the chance to learn how to use this *equipment* to teach?

S: Get to use what?

R: Those *technologies*, to teach their own students?

S: Yeah, *lots* of them do, in fact, we're, (.) right now we're about to inherit some computers for the *preparatory* division that we'll be able to use with those students.

R: So is there any particular software you like to use?

S: Oh, sort of the basic ones like *Music Ace*, or like Alfred's, whatever theirs is. (N,n) Those are the ones, primarily, that *I* personally use. My students have *explored* more of them, probably, than even I have.

R: Thank you. Now that we've talked about curriculum structure, and teacher training and technology, which one do you see as the largest challenge in your program?

S: I think, (N,n) as I mentioned, (.) it's things from all of those things that relate to the fact that this is a *large* school. You know, with like 500 music majors and there's only *one* piano pedagogy faculty member. So it's really hard to, (.) you know, I'm responsible for coordinating the *pedagogy* program, the *group* piano program, the *prep* program, advising the *TAs*, *studying*, *researching*, and stuff like that. So it's really a *challenge*, to be able to *supervise* the teaching of

the students as much as, ideally, I would like to. (N.n) And, also, just staying on top of technology, when that isn't a strong suit for me.

R: So you think that supervision and technology would be the largest?

S: [Yes, I would say so, yes.

R: So, if you could just improve one challenge at a time, which would you be most anxious to improve *immediately*?

S: Well, I think, probably, to me the issue of practical experience, *supervised* teaching experience for students, and, you know, if it were possible to *hire* another pedagogy faculty member who could perhaps oversee the *preparatory* division, do some *teaching* in the program, and especially *supervise* student teachers, that would probably be most helpful here.

R: For you, it's a lot of work, I can see this.

S: And I think that's *typical*, (.) I'm sure you have heard or will hear that from others.

R: Now I'd like to ask you about your vision of an idealized program. If you were going to build up an ideal program, what kind of picture do you see in this ideal program?

S: *Sure*, I think that program would really prepare students *comprehensively* and *enthusiastically* to succeed as professional teacher-musicians in the 21st Century, and it, also, would be *very* tailored to the students' particular needs and *interests* and strengths. I hope that it would, as I mentioned, I really am *passionate* about students becoming interested in independent teaching, I think in the 21st Century, that is a career which can be very *lucrative* for students if they have good models that they can observe, local teachers that they know how to set up, from a *business* perspective, a studio. If they're equipped to teach the new student *group*, or population of the time, if they're, you know, prepared to teach *adult* students, senior citizens, if they can teach early *childhood* music, you know, kindermusic or something like that. (N.n) So the ideal program would, I think, encourage many students to *follow* that route, and prepare them for that route, just because college jobs are *not* that many, and very competitive. (.) So obviously, that would also *entail* an awful lot of teaching experience and supervised teaching experience, of *both* private and group teaching, because I think group teaching, obviously, maximizes *learning*, but also can lead to more *money* for teachers. (.) To be able to *observe* lots of wonderful group and private teaching, and then do it yourself and be *supervised* would be essential. (N.n) For college, those who are interested in *college* teaching, they also need the same opportunities to observe *artistic* teaching and to teach themselves, and be supervised. They also need to be able to teach children and adults, and then of course, college students, both private and group, *many* many teaching experiences, like running a group piano program or a pedagogy program, (.) and then of course, really *comprehensive* coursework, in which the students really learn about the teaching and learning *process*, the literature, the materials, so I guess this program would last about::(hhh) 10 years. Somehow when they would graduate they would go into, like, a *full* time internship where they teach full time, and would still get some observation. You know, (.) because *ideally*, those who are gonna teach at the college level would have teaching experience, (.) either between their bachelors and masters, or masters and doctoral degrees, but sometimes (.) that's not *possible* anymore because of the job market.

R: Could you be more specific about how you would *construct* this program?

S: (N.n) Specific in what way?

R: Like, what kind of requirements or degree plan you would like to lay out from the undergraduate to the doctoral, you know what I mean?

S: Right, (.) well like I said, I sort of feel that, at the *undergraduate* level, students should get a *broad* musical education, focus on piano and performance, but also take pedagogy coursework

and do some teaching through a preparatory division. (N.n) I would hope, then, that those interested in *independent* teaching could go on to a *masters* degree, (.) and in that masters degree, that's where you can specialize more, I think you should *specialize* more in pedagogy and have coursework *every* semester, that focuses, as I said, on all levels and group and private, and of course, supervised teaching experiences and *real life* teaching experiences, either of an assistantship, or teaching in a *prep* program, or a home studio or what have you, doctoral degree, (.) many of those same things, but more focused on college level teaching and then just *real life* experience, as I mentioned, and actually presenting at, maybe, a state *conference*, or writing an article and submitting it to *Keyboard Companion* or *Clavier* or doing an *actual* research program. So, I might have just said the *same* thing, basically.

R: Thank you, very clear. So do you see any possible *obstacles* in this dream?

S: Oh, certainly, (.) I mean, just *time*. (.) A masters degree is *only* two years, four semesters, a doctoral degree, you know, *three*, sometimes four. So just, oftentimes, you only have *two* semesters of coursework, and sometimes at the undergraduate level, only *one*, so just having the time to address all of these different teaching situations, and levels, and *ages* of students, there are so many *topics*.

R: A lot to cover.

S: [You *can't* possibly address everything, so that's, (.) just *time* is a problem, (.) and as I mentioned before, more specific to my job, but probably everywhere, is just faculty time and availability to really, *personally* oversee every single student and make sure they're getting what they need in terms of coursework and internships and, you know, things like that.

R: So can you think of any possible solutions for the "time"?

S: Yeah, I think for, in terms of coursework, (.) I've learned as I've taught more that you just can't *cover* everything, you need to decide what you feel is most *fundamental*, what students *can't* live without, what they'll use most in their teaching. (.) And maybe, as much as they need to be *current*, you also have to think about what is sort of timeless, you know, what will not change. (.) So I personally focus on the *learning* and *teaching* process, the literature, general teaching strategies. So (.) just *deciding* what is most important for them, and the same in terms of teaching experiences. Also, as I mentioned, getting the help of *local* teachers is really *crucial* for me, for them to be able to observe those students, and something I haven't done, which would be *helpful*, would be to possibly set up an *internship* with local teachers, where the students could, maybe, teach under some of their *supervision*. And obviously that would have to be on a *volunteer* basis; there wouldn't really be a way. But I think many teachers would be interested in doing that and would find it *energizing* for teaching. So, (.) I think local, independent teachers are a really *important* asset, especially when you don't have other piano pedagogy faculty members.

R: That's neat. So you think setting up priorities?

S: Yes, *prioritizing*.

R: OK, thank you. Now, my last question is, some research suggests that pedagogy should separate from performance degrees, and some research suggests that it should be combined as one degree. So, in *your* opinion, in your idealized program, what kind of degree would you offer for this?

S: Well, (N.n) I think performance and pedagogy really go *hand* in hand. I'm not sure if this is exactly what you're asking, but thinking of *performance* majors, they need, I mean the students who are interested in majoring in *performance*, think they want to perform as a career, many of them, *most* of them will not be able to support themselves solely on performance, obviously. So

they *need* to be able to teach, and I *hope*, you know with my undergrad and grad performance students who teach, take my courses, to really get them *interested* in teaching and *see* it as a *noble* profession, and something fun and interesting, and something that takes as much thought and skill as *performing*. So I definitely think that performance degrees, *all*, should *include* some pedagogy coursework and teaching experience. For those more interested in the *teaching* side of things, (.) I *really* think performance and pedagogy go hand in hand, I would like to see, probably, degrees at all level that are *called* performance and pedagogy.

R: A combined degree?

S: *Right*, a combined degree. I think our practicing and performance really informs our *teaching*, and vice-versa. And, (N.n) as I mentioned before, in terms of applying for a job, you can't be so *teaching-focused* that you have lost your chops. So for someone who loves the music and loves to play, it's hard to imagine going through a day without, really *making* music.

R: So you think a combined degree should be offered through the undergraduate to the graduate?

S: I think so, *I think so*. Now, obviously, at the doctoral level, a DMA combined, those degrees are combined. With the *Ph.D.*, because those are generally offered through, like a music education department, (.) I don't know if it's possible for that degree to be combined, *but* (.) I think it's important for students to *continue* to study piano, to give recitals themselves, perhaps to take piano literature. You know, (.) to still be *pianists* as well as teachers.

R: Thank you for all your wonderful information.

S: You are welcome.

Interview with Subject E

R: (Subject E), thank you so much for your time today. I'm glad to let you know that your school's piano pedagogy program has been selected as one of the top 20 university piano pedagogy programs by a *group* of people. Can you imagine or think about what kind of characteristics make these people recommend the program?

S: OK, well let's see. (N.n) I have several things that come to mind. First of all, I think that our school in general has (.) a *reputation* for, you know, high level *performance*, (.) as well as, I feel like our system for pedagogy, we have *four* semesters of course work, as well as two semesters available for *student teaching*. We have, being a *large* school, we have a very large group piano program from which to use in terms of laboratory teaching and observation. And also, this is just from my perspective, I don't know if outside perspectives, you know, outside (.) people would know about this, but I think our program is strong in the fact that the *person* teaching pedagogy, myself, is also *not* teaching applied lessons, so the students that are in the pedagogy class are from all *different* applied teachers, of which I am *not* involved directly. So it almost seems like I am somewhat of an *impartial* influence on them apart from their regular teachers. So those are just some of the things that came to mind.

R: And you talked about how you have *four semesters* of piano pedagogy courses, right? So can you talk about the curriculum content that you offer?

S: //Sure. Well, the first semester, well the first *two* semesters are undergraduate-level pedagogy courses. The first semester is concentrated *beginner-level* teaching, and you know, sort of creating a *home studio*, finding a teaching *philosophy*, and then just kind of an overview of different piano *methods* that are on the market and the content and how to sequence materials and so forth. So, just the *beginning* basics of teaching and piano pedagogy. The second semester focuses on *intermediate-level* teaching, so it's somewhat of a continuation, only we're just moving into a *harder* repertoire for that, maybe *teenage* student or those students that have taken maybe a little longer. Following that is two semesters of *graduate level* pedagogy. (.) The first graduate semester is focused on *group teaching*. That would include, (.) you know, *setting* up a group piano program, (.) coming up with a *syllabus*, ways of teaching musicianship skills, lots of *observation*, there's a chance to do a lot of teaching in that class since we do have so many *group* piano classes here, and *lots* of observation opportunities, perusal of the materials that are on the market for group instruction. (.) And then the fourth semester is focused on *advanced* level teaching, and of course there're *lots* of opportunities for the students to *observe* our own piano *faculty* working with advanced-level students. In addition to that we have two semesters of *student teaching*, and students take that at a *variety* of places in their degree, usually, (.) of course, they take it *after* they've had a semester or two of pedagogy, usually the undergraduate. But (.) it's a semester of *private* student teaching and a semester of *group* student teaching, so the pedagogy majors are *required* to take both semesters of those.

R: So you mean another *two* additional semesters for student teaching?

S: [Right, so if I had to add it together, we would really have *six* semesters available.

R: But that student teaching is for graduate students?

S: No, (.) it's actually undergraduate, it's a 4000 level course. So it's, since our pedagogy degree is primarily at the undergraduate level, those *requirements* for student teaching, both private and group are both 4000 level courses.

R: So, do you offer a piano pedagogy degree at the graduate level?

S: *Not per se*, (.) I mean, (.) the piano pedagogy at the graduate level is really more of something that is *attached* to another degree, usually *music ed.* (N.n) And it results in a way, where students take pedagogy as an *elective* course work, but it isn't *per se* a degree in piano pedagogy at the *graduate level*.

R: So mainly the degree is for undergraduates?

S: Yes.

R: So, for the *group teaching*, is that mainly for the graduate level, or for both?

S: (.) It's a *graduate* level course, primarily because the group teaching is focused around, like, *college* group teaching and what they would normally encounter in a *college* or *university* setting with musicianship classes and things applied to the keyboard. (N.n) But it's often the case that I have a *mixture* of graduate and undergraduate students who need pedagogy credit and I often have to *adapt* the class to the needs of a *mixture* of students.

R: So can I say, (.) that for the undergraduate level, your teacher training focuses more on one on one setting?

S: (.) Well, I mean we do touch on group teaching in the first and second undergraduate semesters of piano, but it's not the *main* focus.

R: Do you have a certain standard textbook that you use for those two different degree levels?

S: Actually, (N.n) for all four semesters, I use *The Well-tempered Keyboard Teacher* by Marianne Uszler, Stewart Gordon and Scott McBride-Smith. It really does a great job of covering most of the material that we need and then I *supplement* that with other materials in addition to that. But the only *required* text that I use on a regular basis is *The Well-tempered Keyboard Teacher*.

R: Thank you. One more question for this: On the undergraduate level, are they required to play for recitals?

S: (.) You know, I think they *do* have to do a student recital, yes, but I don't think that the requirements are quite as *strict* as in the performance degree as far as *repertoire*. The main difference between the performance degree and the pedagogy degree, on *paper*, is that the performance degree has more hours of *applied* lessons. The pedagogy major would have the extra *two* semesters of student teaching, whereas the performance majors aren't required to take that. So there's *really*, very *little* difference between the degree plan on paper.

R: Now we've talked about the curriculum content, I would like to focus more on *teacher training*. (.) How do your students get teacher training through the courses?

S: (N.n) Well, I'd kind of identify that as the *weakest* area, in my opinion, of our program, is that (.) I don't have readily available, *real-life* students for our pedagogy students to teach during the *class*. Our class meets during the day, so it's a little bit difficult to get *anyone*, any school-aged students to be there to observe or to teach, observe while I'm teaching, and so forth. We do some *mock* teaching, in class, that students teach each other. But *several* students already have students that they teach outside of school. But that *isn't* necessarily required in the course, but they just happen to do some teaching off-campus. So I'm thinking that that's my *biggest* area of weakness, is that I would like to see, you know, more opportunities for them to have some *real* teaching in class that can be observed and commented on.

R: And is this more a focus on individual teaching, right? I mean one-on-one teaching.

S: [Right.

R: So do your students get a chance to observe the group teaching?

S: Oh yeah, that happens very frequently, actually. Even in the undergraduate and graduate courses they're required to do some observation of the group classes, and from many different levels.

R: And that's part of the course?

S: Yes, that's part of the course.

R: Thank you, so now that we've talked about curriculum, I'd like to ask you about your own opinion about pedagogy instructors because I have been seeing so *many* different opinions, like it should have a pedagogy degree or it should have a performance degree for being a pedagogy teacher. So in your opinion, what kind of degree is *best* for being a pedagogy teacher?

S: Well, (.) this::: may sound a little strange, because I'm going to actually recommend that you have a degree in performance and pedagogy, (.) a *combination*, which is not what I have. (.) You know, I have *all* performance degrees. Now I'm not trying to suggest, obviously, that someone with a performance degree would not make a good pedagogy instructor, I mean, that's *obviously* the situation that I'm in. I *feel*, though, that in my own experience, that I've had to *trust* a lot of my own teaching experience, and then having some experience now in teaching the pedagogy class, that I have... (.) There's been a learning curve that I've been involved in that (.) I could *probably* have been better prepared for had I had more pedagogy experience through my degree. So in the best possible scenario, that's why I would recommend a *balance* of performance and pedagogy if the person knew ahead of time that they were going to be teaching pedagogy. But I think, oftentimes, we *don't* know we're going to be teaching pedagogy, and we sort of *arrive* at that by one way or another, and we bring our teaching experience, life experience, and our education, academically, all kind of *pools* together to create a good experience in that teaching scenario, but I think in the *best* possible scenario, would be to have a *combination* of things in the degree.

R: Right, so you mean a combination. What kind of combination degree you refer? Could you be more specific?

S: //Well (.) I think I mean, (.) at *all* levels of, maybe, undergraduate and graduate degrees, that (.) put pedagogy and performance on an *equal* level. I don't think that one should sort of be placed *over* the other. I think that they need to be in equal balance so that, (.) I mean, I'm actually recommending a degree in performance and pedagogy where they're equal (N.n) in terms of course work and experience and training.

R: Thank you, and now I'd like to ask you about the finances in your program. How are the finances distributed in your program?

S: (.) Well, to be very honest, as a lecturer, I am *full-time* but as a *lecturer* I really do not hear any information about budget. I really have no idea where the money comes *from* or how much money is allotted. I basically just set up my class and (.) I'm more focused on what the needs of my immediate students are each semester, and (.) as I need equipment or financial expenditures I ask for them, and they're either *granted* or not *granted* based on budget availability. But I'm really *not* part of the budgetary process, if that makes sense. So I'm really kind of not in the loop there, so I *really* don't have any idea how it's structured or set up.

R: So you have *no* control with that?

S: No.

R: OK, that's been kind of a common thing around most of the programs. Well, now, let's shift to technology. Could you talk about *technology*? How is the technology *used* in your program?

S: Well, I do *quite* a bit of technology, I'm *pretty* comfortable with it, and I actually *enjoy* finding new ways of incorporating it into our program. I probably enjoy it more than my

students do. But I do some, what I call ‘*traditional* technology activities,’ by now they’re considered traditional, where we use a digital *sequencer*, and where we do projects where we learn how to record onto a sequencer and play back and manipulate the sounds and what not, and also talking about how that can *enhance* your *teaching* experience and the *learning* experience. I have recently acquired a new Yamaha Disclavier in my studio, so I’m kind of *busy* this year trying to figure out different ways that we could *incorporate* that piece of equipment into our pedagogy class and different projects where that would come into play. (.) I’m a frequent user of *PowerPoint* in lectures, and I work *a lot* to get the students involved in incorporating PowerPoint into their *presentations* as much as possible. I frequently am using *e-mail* with my class. I think I’ve *squeezed* a lot of extra time out of our time together outside of our class by using e-mail. The students are required to put together a traditional notebook of materials at the end of the class, but a lot of it, now, is done on e-mail and is burned to a *CD*. And it’s getting *further* and further away from using paper. Everything is beginning to be done, all *electronically*. And what I’m about to investigate further is a thing called *WebCT* where, (.) it’s sort of like a central server that students and faculty can *download* material to, where students can view them and share materials, and it’s *all*, you know, in *one* location, and it sounds to me like a *great* way to *extend* your class time beyond your actual class meeting time. (.) I’m *not* as familiar as I would like to be with it, and that’s kind of where I’m going with technology in that regard. In addition to *all* the other things that are on the market in terms of teaching tools and theory software, we do go over that as much as we can *incorporate* in the class time, an *overview* of what’s available on the market and how they could use that in their private and group instruction.

R: So students get chances to use all the different kinds of technology and apply it?

S: [Well:::I wouldn’t say they get chances to use it. I mean, as far as equipment that is available here on campus, if there’s available equipment we get the chance to use it, but I wouldn’t say they get to use all the *software*. (.) I mean, at best we may talk about the software but they *rarely* get a chance to actually go out and *use* it unless they want to purchase it. Our pedagogy library does not have a *whole lot* of software. They don’t send the software as readily as they do *new-issued* music or *sheet* music and so forth from the *publishers*.

R: So we’ve talked about technology and the curriculum, finances and instructors, from all the things we’ve mentioned, what do you see as the largest challenge in your program?

S: I would have to go back to the teaching component within the class. I really feel like that’s a vital component that we’re missing right now, and you know, (.) it’s a big challenge for me, being the only instructor in the pedagogy department, because I need to (.) find a way of incorporating some outside students into our program so that our students can have some real life teaching experience that I could observe. So it may take some *planning* and some *juggling* of schedules and so forth. (.) That’s the *area* that I feel is the *most* immediate need.

R: You mean teacher training?

S: Teacher training, *right*, (.) there being some *real* experience teaching while they’re in the class so they can get feedback and some *actual* experience doing it.

R: So if you improve one challenge at this time, what one would you want to change most anxiously, right away?

S: I would go back to that *again*, the teacher training issue and getting *away from* the mock teaching in the class and replacing that with real life teaching experience, with, you know, opportunities for *observation* and *feedback* while they’re doing that. That would be my first thing to change.

R: So that one you would like to change *immediately* if you could.

S: Right.

R: Now, that we've talked about the status of your program, my second research question is your *vision* of an idealized pedagogy program. The first thing I'd like to ask you, if you were going to build up an idealized pedagogy program, *totally* from your own opinion, what kind of picture would you see, as an idealized program?

S: Well, some of the things I was thinking about in this question would be a program that has attached to it a *strong preparatory* program. Where, you know, (.) a group of *school-aged* students would be *available* for students to *observe* and to *actually* work with, and like we said, more *opportunities* for teacher training. Of course, I would want *unlimited* access to technology and the finances for developing that so that we could always be sort of on the *cutting edge* of what's available. (.) And third, I really think it's important to have the *support* and *input* of other keyboard faculty members, so that the pedagogy program can be a sort of a *group effort* in terms of what its focus is. Because I think so much of what we learn about teaching *comes from* the person we're studying with on a one-to-one basis. That's such a *strong* influence that I think it could only help a pedagogy program for an *entire* keyboard faculty to at least have an *opportunity* to have input, to put forth ideas and you know, *concepts* that they think would be important to be *in* the mix, you know, of the pedagogy program. (N.n) So those were my main thoughts.

R: So you mean a *strong* preparatory program, *strong* finances and *support* from other faculty? I'd like to go back a little bit. Does your school have a preparatory program?

S: *No*, (.) we do have a community music school, but that is not *restricted* to *school-age* children. I mean, it's anyone, I guess, who would like to take some music lessons for non-credit. But *currently* that program isn't really *coordinated* with the pedagogy program. That's something that I would attach to my *main* goal of more teacher training. I'm planning on investigating the *possibility* of *incorporating* that community music program into our program a little bit more so we can work together for some more opportunity there.

R: We've talked about technology, if you need some kind of new equipments, will the school support you and give you what you need?

S: Well they have so far, as *best* that they can, and again, we're coming back to budgetary concerns. (.) I think whenever it is *possible*, when I request some piece of technology or something, the *effort* is made to get it. It's not always a guarantee that I'll get it. I think (.) there is probably more support in the budget *for* technology-related equipment, (.) and in some ways I think that money is sometimes *earmarked* because that's a *hot topic* these days, incorporating technology into your program. So it seems like money is often earmarked for those types of activities more so than, say, (.) money to bring a person on campus to do a program or a recital. So I think that there is some effort, probably *university-wide*, to encourage technology *growth* and incorporating that into various programs. So I think they make money *available* for that type of thing *easier* than they do for other things.

R: That's nice. So in your idealized program, what kind of *obstacles* do you see when you're going to build up this program?

S: (N.n) Well, probably::: (hhh) a *lack* of what I said earlier. Since finances *are* limited, and the support of other faculty members *is* limited, and in some cases *non-existent*, or even at *odds* with other teachers' perspectives, so there's a lot of, (.) you know, disagreement, maybe, in that regard. And there is *no* preparatory program for me to draw on aside from the community music school, (.) you know, and (.) that I'm not sure *addresses* our needs completely, so far. So I would say, just the *lack* of those things, in my experience.

R: So do you see any *possible* solution for those obstacles?

S: (.) Uhm, yeah, I think it really comes down to *me*, (.) personally, investigating what the possibilities are. I mean, I am the *one* that will be investigating the *community* music school to see if it will work as a way for more teacher training, (.) and as far as the *technology* goes, (.) I don't see a *real* solution there, other than just *budgeting* more for it. *But*, if a preparatory program was in existence, I know *a lot* of times the preparatory program can generate a lot of *income* which would sometimes help defer the *cost* of technology as well as other things that you may need in your program that *aren't* necessarily budgeted for. (.) So, I think that some kind of a *prep program* has *a lot* of possibilities both for *teacher training* and *generation* of some income.

R: I see. So do you see that your school is going to have this kind of a program in the *future*?

S: It's really too early to say:: If I had to guess, I would say *no*, because I would see that the community music program would more probably be *more* likely to morph into something we could use for teacher training before a prep program would be started. (.) And it may be that the community music program would have some *qualities* of a prep program, but I don't see it being an *exclusively* preparatory program.

R: OK, thank you. You talked about a combination degree, a combined degree, so in your *ideal* program, what kind of degree would you like to offer for the different levels?

S: Well, (.) I think that (.) I would prefer to see, as I said before, the *combination* degrees where pedagogy and performance are more or less *equal*. I do think that at the early years, the early stages like in a *bachelors* degree situation, that students really do need to strengthen their *playing* skills, and then let's go back to the fact that I cited that as one of our strengths of our program, is that (.) I generally get really *strong* performance students in *my class*, so they have that very important strength of being able to play well, and I think that's a *great* influence on their teaching. (.) So I would definitely want to *retain* the strength of a performance degree at the undergraduate level, and also *combine* that with a pedagogy emphasis. So I'm thinking, I kind of like the way our bachelors degree is set up where it's a performance degree with *pedagogy emphasis*. I think maybe we could stand to have a little bit *more* pedagogy emphasis, but it's challenging to *balance* those numbers, you know. (.) And *equating* performance experience with pedagogy experience, they're not exactly the same so it's difficult to attach, (.) you know, credit amount to, you know, each of those equally. It's something to be *looked* into. But I like the idea of combining the two degrees. (.) I think as you get *further* into the graduate level, I think maybe we still *need* emphasis on performance and pedagogy, but maybe more emphasis on the *research* component, or more of the pedagogy aspects while still *retaining* the performance aspect.

R: So, still performance degree with emphasis in pedagogy?

S: [Yes, I still think that the performance degree *with* emphasis, (.) but I think, (.) I'm just saying that as you progress from bachelors, to masters, to say the doctorate or Ph.D. level, instead of, sort of just equating equal pedagogy and performance, maybe a little more emphasis on *research*, more, (.) I guess even *more* emphasis on *original* research and studies and investigating topics that haven't been delved into *thoroughly* yet. And doing original research and *groundbreaking* types of research at the *doctorate* or *Ph.D.* level.

R: So for the masters degree, I'm sorry, I know it's hard to define this. For the masters degree, you'd still like to offer the *performance* degree with a pedagogy emphasis.

S: I think so, *yes*.

R: What about the doctorate?

S: Well, (.) I think that it could, I would support either. I guess it would be like a *Ph.D.*, which would be more academically structured, but it still needs to have some performance *component* to it. (.) But I think, whether it's called a performance degree with emphasis, or whether it's a Ph.D. in pedagogy with performance emphasis, I think, as *long* as there still is that *mixture* of performance and pedagogy at all levels, I would think that would be best.

R: But *more* research components?

S: [*More* research components, as you go *higher* in the spectrum. Right.

R: Thank you so much.

Interview with Subject F

R: I would like to let you know that your program has been selected as one of the *top 20*. Could you think about the characteristics that have made your program so strong to be recommended?

S: Yes. (.) First of all, it's *one* of the oldest programs. I mean, it dates from the early *1960s*, founded by (person) and her colleagues, (.) and at that time there were very *few*, if any other pedagogy degree programs, and so it got noticed early. It became a *model* during the 70s and 80s when the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy did *case* studies on different institutional models for piano pedagogy. There were *six* case studies and (school) was *one* of those. They weren't identified, but everybody *knew* what it was. The track record of the graduates is another reason people would think it's outstanding, I mean, to my knowledge we have 100 percent *placement* of people teaching in the profession at all levels. I mean, the majority are independent teachers, but people go on to doctoral programs of their choice. (.) Some people go on into higher ed right out of this program, or they go on into community schools or other kinds of institutions. (.) And the one *attribute* that makes it *truly* different from just about any other in the country, even *now*, is the *extensive* and *intensive* nature of the *supervised* teaching internship. (.) What I'm stating, and this is subject to *verification*, but is that masters level students who enter this program get *more* actual teaching experience with a whole *variety* of student populations, and (.) it's teaching experience under *relatively* close supervision of the faculty, so there's a *constant* atmosphere of exchange and feedback. In other words, they're not just given a lot of teaching, they're given a lot of teaching and then given a lot of *help* with that teaching. That's probably the *single* most *distinctive* feature of this program. (.) The coursework is typical of what you would find 11 hours of required pedagogy coursework in addition to that internship. (.) But I think those are going to be *typical* in most institutions. There's also a *fairly* happy collaboration at SMU between the piano *pedagogy* program and its faculty and the piano *performance* program and its faculty. You know in a lot of institutions they kind of *fight* with one another, or the piano pedagogy may be treated as *second* class, and it's not that way here. (.) The performance faculty *appreciates* the fact that the pedagogy program is bringing in many of the best performance students as well. We also have relatively *generous* financial aid, although that's precarious right now, as tuition goes up and financial aid stays the same, but at least historically we've been able to do *well* by most people who are wanting to come here. So those are reasons.

R: Now I'd like to go back a little bit. How *big* is your pedagogy program?

S: Well, first of all, let me clarify, there are *two* graduate options: a master of music in piano performance and pedagogy, so that's a *double* major, 36 hours. (.) We also offer a master of music education with an *emphasis* in piano pedagogy. That's a traditional 30 hours. The double degree, to be admitted, one has to meet the same criteria one would meet to enter a performance-only program, and then to that we add the pedagogy. (.) But let's say somebody is not as interested or skillful in performance, *or* somebody is much more interested in research or teaching, the master of *music education* is an appropriate option for them. We *don't* have an undergraduate degree in piano pedagogy anymore, there *was*, but in the mid 90s NASM told us that if we were going to continue to offer both a masters and a bachelors, we *compromised*. (.) We do at the undergraduate level offer a bachelor of music in *performance* with an *emphasis* in pedagogy, so somebody would go with a bachelor of music in piano performance and then by taking an extra number of course hours they can get that emphasis.

R: How many graduate students do you have?

S: Generally, we have about 6-10 graduate students. (.) I never want to have less than 6, because of the *prep* department. We have to have a certain number of people teach the prep program. But 10 is the maximum. Also, did you want me to tell you the size of the faculty?

R: Yes, please.

S: The faculty consists of myself. I am the head of the pedagogy program, so I am full time *tenured* at the rank of professor. (.) Most of my time is not going in that direction right now. And then I have *two* full time faculty members at the rank of lecturer, one with an earned doctorate, one with an earned masters.. I teach graduate pedagogy courses. The two lecturers *directly* supervise internships and teach in the piano prep department and *manage* the piano prep department. (.) And then we have one part time *adjunct* lecturer, who also does internship supervision and participates in the class piano program. (.) So there's me, and then there are two full time and one part time.

R: That's more than the other schools I know.

S: //Well, especially when there are only 8 or 10 students in the program. But those lecturers, you see, are not only supervising internships but they're *also* teaching a *large* number of pre-college students in the prep department.

R: Could you please talk about the curriculum content at both the undergraduate level and for the graduate degree?

S: //Well, in a sense they're the *same*. Because of the small numbers of students, when I offer graduate pedagogy one, undergraduates attend the same *class*. Now, there are significant differences in both the *quantity* and the *quality* of work. They have different *syllabi*, but they attend the *same* lectures and are dealing with the same topics so I can talk about them at the same time. There are *two* core classes. They have piano pedagogy one, piano pedagogy two. (.) Piano pedagogy one is an *investigation* and *analysis* of tools, techniques, materials, *trends* and *skills* needed to teach music at the piano or keyboard to elementary level students from the beginning, and it focuses to some extent on methods, but it also focuses on educational psychology, and it also focuses on *issues* such as teaching technique, such as teaching creativity and attempts to provide, you know, a broad basis of understanding where the field is on those issues at this time. (.) A lot of pedagogy one classes just review methods, and that's probably the *least* important thing we do in this class, although we do it. Piano pedagogy two would be the same attributes, you know, investigation of the tools and techniques, and skills, etc etc, needed to teach at the *intermediate* and the *advanced* levels. I'm always very *strong* on the notion that we're teaching *music* first and piano or keyboard second so there's that kind of broad bias to those classes. So those classes are offered *every other* fall, so it takes two years for the whole cycle to run, so pedagogy one is offered in the fall and pedagogy two is offered the next fall. (.) Now in the spring, there are also two *alternating* courses. One of them is called Survey of *Pre-college* Literature. It's like a piano literature class, only the focus is on everything students would *do* from the time they finish a method book until they went to college in piano, so it's that vast black hole of repertoire that includes *Anna Magdalena Notebook*, *Inventions*, perhaps a first suite of Bach, etc. That's a very hands on class. It's mostly spent at the piano *playing* music, but it also involves building *bibliographies* and *correlating* and *evaluating* literature. (.) Then the other alternate class in the spring is called Group Piano Procedures, and it's basically a study of *principles* of teaching in a group, not just a lab, but the emphasis is on teaching in a *group*. (.) So there's some of just the technical skills of pushing a button, but *more* often sort of the psychological principles operating in a group and what methods and techniques and tools are

used there. (.) I'm *thinking* about changing that course in the future. The *reason* that class exists is that when the program was founded, the graduate students did *not* get much experience teaching groups because they were taught exclusively by the faculty. As it's *evolved*, they get quite a lot of teaching in groups now and I *don't* think they really need that course so much anymore. Well, they need the course, but I'm going to call it *Current Trends*. (.) What I mean by that is the application of *technology*, everything from a disklavier to an Ipod to, (.) how to burn a CD of your student's recital, to how to make a video of a lesson and edit it. Those kinds of technological skills, as *well* as really state of the art understanding of research and music education and psychology. (.) So I'd like to *replace* the class piano procedures with a *new* class called Current Trends. Now to finish that up, (.) the graduate students enroll for internship assistantships every semester as a *required* course, and the *extent* of that course depends on the extent of their financial aid. Let's say that they have no financial aid. They register for internship, and they would teach *in* the prep program or class piano program, probably five hours a week. A little bit of that is preparation time, but most of that is contact time. (.) And they get graded for that and they have *conferences* with the faculty on their teaching. If they're on a full assistantship, instead of only being five hours a week, that would be *15* hours a week, so it basically triples the number of students and the amount of time spent in the actual hands on teaching part of it. So that's the curriculum.

R: So I'd like to go back to the internships. That is mainly for graduate students, right? So how do undergraduate students get hands on teaching training?

S: Well they, there is an undergraduate class called *Practicum* in Piano Pedagogy. Every undergraduate piano student has to take practicum for two hours, one hour at a time, if they do the *emphasis* in piano pedagogy. They sign up for practicum for three hours, two times. And we make a similar assignment for them. They work in the piano preparatory department. We can't legally use undergraduate students to *teach* other undergraduate students, so they don't take part in the class piano program, but they do *three* things under the heading of that practicum. They observe a lot of teaching of different settings and different populations, and different teachers. (.) They *assist* our faculty in group teaching of pre-college aged students, and they actually teach a limited number of pre-college students under faculty supervision. An undergraduate getting that emphasis would probably only get two or three students, where as a graduate student would have a minimum of 5 or 6 and *up to* 12 or 13.

R: So they both practice individual teaching and group teaching?

S: Yes. At the undergraduate level, we call it practicum. At the graduate level, we call it internship. But it is the *same* thing, it's just question of *how much*, how much supervision.

R: Could you tell me a little bit more about the prep program?

S: I will give you a little bit of history first. (.) It was started when the pedagogy program came into being in the 1960s. (Person) *founded* it at the same time by *pooling* her private students and the private students of two other teachers here. They organized this program and said, "Come to (school) and take from us there." And by *doing* that, it *generated* enough *money* to help the scholarships and other things. It became very, very big, and when I say that, it *rapidly* grew to 450 students, all taking piano, no other instruments, and a staff of almost 10, and a *large* number of graduate students in the late 60s and 70s. (.) In the mid 80s, the administration decided it was really *too* big, and so it *consciously* reduced its size to around 100 students and a smaller staff with *higher* standards and *better* balance with the rest of the music program. Right now we have about 75 or 80 students.

R: So all of the faculty members in that program are graduate students?

S: Well, except for the two and a half lecturers that I mentioned, but the *majority* of the teaching, the actual private teaching is done by graduate students under supervision.

R: What are the ages of the students in the prep program?

S: Well we start with what we would term an average aged beginner, which would be six or seven, and then all the way *through* high school. We also take adult hobbyist students.

R: How are finances distributed in your program?

S: First, my salary and expenses are, you *know* a tenured track faculty, so I don't cost the prep program anything. I cost the *university*. (.) However, we charge tuition to the public for students who are *enrolled* in the program. The tuition that is *generated*, the revenue that is generated from that tuition, is *adequate* to support the two lecturer positions, *provided* this. (.) There are also two tiers. There's the senior faculty, which are the faculty, and teaching fellows, which are the graduate students. So people pay a different *rate* if they really, *really* want to be with faculty and want to pay for it they can do that. A lot of the revenue that is generated, (.) is *generated* by teaching that is done by graduate teaching fellows. It is that *differential* that allows us to support the lecturers. (N.n) In the early days, when (person) founded the program, tuition for (school) was a *lot* lower than it is now, and the prep department *actually* generated the money to pay for the assistantships *as well as* the faculty. It could not do that anymore. (.) So the assistantship money that pays for the graduate students' tuition and pays a portion of their stipends now comes from the an endowment.

R: You've talked about the new course that you're going to offer "*Current Trend*", and you mentioned about technology, could you please describe the technology used in your program?

S: Sure, well, (.) of course a piano is technology too, and we use pianos all the time. I also have to say that since I've been less *directly* involved, the use of electronic and computer technology has gone *down a* little bit. That's one of my *big* things. I spend a lot of time performing and teaching *using* digital keyboards, using keyboards, using sequencers and so on. And the current prep faculty are *less* experienced and care less about that, so it's *logical* that they would use it less, but I'm trying to *make up* for that with what I teach in the pedagogy class and what I try to get the graduate students to do. We have two Disklavier grand pianos in the piano prep area. One is in my private studio but I let the students teach in there a lot. And one is in our pedagogy resource room. Both are DC1s, a small Disklavier Mark IV. (N.n) We have one *small* studio that is set up with an upright piano and a digital piano with a sequencer, (.) and I encourage people to make use of the sequencer by playing MIDI disk accompaniments, by *recording* their students' performances and so on. (.) We use the piano lab. The university piano lab is used for some of the piano prep department group lessons in the after school areas. That's an *11* station, counting the teacher's station, Yamaha lab, and they're all 88 key weighted digital pianos. Each one has a Macintosh computer as well. (.) That room also has a *projection* system so that whatever is on the teacher's computer can be projected so that the students can see it as well. It also has a Visualizer. So those are used pretty extensively in the *group* teaching.

R: So students get the chance to learn how to utilize those instruments?

S: Yes, and I, they *all* are expected to learn more value from them than the current faculty, so it's going to vary the amount of expertise they have. But yes, they are supposed to as *part* of the coursework.

R: Is there any software you prefer in particular?

S: For *sequencing* on the computer we use Digital Performer, for notation on all of those computers in the piano lab, they are all wirelessly connected to the internet, and we've been using Martha Hilley's Piano Text, and that allows us to access the *websites* that go with that from

each student's keyboard. For notation in the piano lab, all the computers have Sibelius Version 3. We *try* to keep the software to the latest version. Now, (.) a few of those, I think three of those keyboards also, or those computers also have *Finale*, if there's somebody who wants to use *Finale*, because we open that room for laboratory time on a *limited* basis, so *Finale* is on a few of them. We also have *Home Concert*, which is the *score* following sequencer, and I don't think anybody's using that, and that's going to be my cause next year. It *plays* MIDI files, but it allows the MIDI file to follow the student performance in both dynamic and tempo fluctuations. Right now, we don't have software for theory. I think that is our deficiency. (.) We do have *Band in a Box* on all those computers as well. Another thing I'd like to do, but, we don't have any theory software, I'd like to put maybe *Music Ace*. (N.n) Oh, we have one thing that no one has it. One of our piano faculty members has been doing a fairly extensive study on *reduced* size keyboards, the Steinbuehler 7/8th size which can be installed on any piano, so in one of our prep studios we have a 7/8th sized piano so that, for beginners or for *small* handed older pianists, they can actually practice and take their lessons on that. I am excited about it.

R: Earlier you mentioned the Martha Hilley's textbook, is this what you use for your class?

S: Presently (school) *college* class piano courses, that would be the classes for majors who are not piano majors, and also classes for students who are *non*-majors, we are using the Martha Hilley textbooks, yes. *Piano for Pleasure* and *Piano for the Developing Musician*.

R: So what textbooks do you use for your pedagogy classes?

S: Well, I use a *set* of textbooks, I still use *Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* as a core text. I have everybody purchase Frances Clark's *Questions and Answers*, and I now have them purchase Richard Chronister's *Piano Teacher's Legacy*. And then I *mix* things up a little bit.

R: Earlier you talked earlier about faculty members, now I'd like you to talk about what kind of qualifications, what kind of degree are best for teaching a pedagogy class?

S: Well, I think the answer to that goes, it kind of goes without saying but I'll say it anyway, and of course this is my opinion, in a sense, and I mean this with all *humility*, I think that I personify that. And that is a person with a very strong *foundation* in performance at a *professional* level. I would prefer that be at least through the masters level, and then one in which the performing career goes on. And then, doctoral level work that is, if it's not in music education, has a *strong* music education component. So I would think, to put it in simple terms, masters degree in performance, continued activity as performer, Ph.D. in music ed is the *ideal* combination for me, because, even in a DMA in performance and pedagogy, and there are many fine degrees out there, I don't want to belittle them, there's *such* focus on performance, and the *time* it takes to play all those recitals, one is not likely to acquire the *breadth* or the knowledge of the *research* base or research *methodology* or the understanding of efficacious application of technology, I mean those are just *not* part of a DMA and (.) I think all those are critical *critical* components of the pedagogy professor. Well, for the most part, is really *training* not future pedagogy professors, but future teachers. The handful who go on to be pedagogy professors are going to be in the *minority*, and the majority and the true bright spot in the whole field is in independent teaching. That's where one can go into the world and if you know what you're doing and have a lot of energy and an entrepreneurial spirit you can make a great life and a great living for yourself. (.) But if those skills are going to be at least initially imparted through the pedagogy program, the pedagogy professor has to have that kind of knowledge, *not* just a knowledge of all 32 Beethoven sonatas.

R: You discussed curriculum, technology, finance, and also instructors. In your program, which one do you see as the *largest* challenge you are facing?

S: (N.n) I thought I had a pat answer for that question. (.) What we face here, I don't think necessarily represents what the *whole* world is facing. Our program, (.) well, no, I think the challenge we face is *preparing* the pedagogy students for a successful and fruitful career, so the greatest challenge we face is the challenge they face, and that is *bringing* about the changes in society that will place a *greater* value on participation in music making. Their challenge is trying to find a place in *society* for what they do in a culture that is increasingly driven by *consumerism*, by *marketing*. It flies in the face of what our culture values. I think that is our biggest challenge. That can only happen, I think, *one* person at a time, when somebody realizes that being involved in making music is *really* worthwhile, and the *effort* it takes and what you spend on lessons is really worthwhile because it doesn't show up as *immediate* gratification. It doesn't make a person thinner, or make them more tan, or sexier, or it doesn't make them more money, but sort of the timeless *inherent* value in great art. (.) And that can have a lot of different definitions because great art to me might be jazz music, it might even be rock and roll. There's a limited amount of rock and roll that's great, but there is some. And if it is great, it has certain things in *common*. I mean, one thing is it's apt to be *difficult*. It's apt to be challenging, so helping prepare our graduate students to *face* that world with realism and optimism and the tools that they will need to succeed, I think is our greatest challenge.

R: So you've talked about the biggest problem, so if you had the chance to deal with one challenge at a time in your program, which would you like to resolve immediately?

S: (N.n) Well, we're having a *budgetary* problem right now, and I would like to resolve the budgetary problem so that I can pay the staff *better*. That's something I didn't allude to, but in other words, I think they should be *paid* a lot more than they are, and I don't have the money to pay them, and right now, since the prep department isn't making more money, I don't have the resources for that. (N.n) I think inside of our curriculum, (.) when I talked about that new course, because the things that I want to see happen, that are a *part* of that course, are good, *musical* and pedagogically useful, use of technology. There's no reason to *fear* technology, none at all. It can only make us more *effective* if we learn how to use it. And I don't mean gimmicky fun and games. I mean really, ways that help students be better, more *alert*, more *alive*, more aware musicians. And related to that, talking about state of the art research and human learning, I think that even in this program we are prone to fall *victim* to teaching the way we were taught. The way people parent the way they were parented. (.) And we know so much more than we did 10 or 15 years ago about how people learn and how people acquire skill. It's all out there in the research, but I don't see much of that research coming *back* to help us be better teachers, and so I think there's a *gap* there that I want to address in the curriculum, (.) and both of it has to do with things that are new, new technology, new knowledge, and *finding* a way to get that., because most of what we teach is very *old*, the piano is an old instrument, the repertory is very old. And if it's going to live *beyond* the near future, I think it's going to have to *benefit* from new knowledge and new technology.

R: All right, now we need to totally switch to my second research question. Now, if you were king and you were going to build up an idealized pedagogy program, what kind of picture is in your mind? What would you do and how would you construct this program?

S: It would be in some ways very much like we have here *already*, and I have mentioned a *retooling* of part of the curriculum. (.) Now, I would, here are some dreams, but they may be no more than that. One is to be able to have and *really* control the balance of the students that the pedagogy students teach. See, we're *stuck* with having them teach who we have. Like I'd like everybody to have a beginning student, and a second year student, and a third year student, and

some advanced students, but we *don't* always have enough of all of them to go around, so we have to *compromise* and make the best of what we have. Another thing is, I would create *longer* days so that graduate students could have time to practice enough *as well as* do their academic work *as well as* teach. Of course, I'm joking when I say create longer days, but I've often thought maybe of going to a *three* year program in which the first year would probably be nothing but *typical* performance masters where they'd really focus on piano performing. They'd take pedagogy courses but probably not do a lot of teaching. The second year they'd *continue* in performance, play a recital and start their teaching internship, the third year *devoted* to nothing *but* teaching, and then ongoing piano, but no academics, no recitals that you had to play. Now that starts to sound more like the *doctoral* program than the masters program, but that would be my dream, one that I don't think is likely to occur. (N.n) Well of course I'd like to have a studio with a *fine* grand piano, a Disklavier and a digital piano for every teacher. If we could, maybe, if you're asking me to really *dream*, we'd have a better building with a whole wing devoted to nothing *but* the piano pedagogy program in which everyone would have their own *studios* and there would be *candid* observation, like they use in music therapy, where there might be a place where the staff could *observe* without being in the room. (.) And I would like a better tailored facility that would increase our *effectiveness*.

R: So in your dream, do you see any possible obstacles that you would be facing?

S: [Yeah, money and time.

R: So to resolve this, do you have any possible solutions to the obstacles?

S: (N.n) Major donors (hhh). (.) I don't see a *practical* solution. In another word, a practical solution would be a *raised* tuition for the piano prep students, but it's already pretty much as *high* as it can go. And it will go up a little bit every year, but not enough to give us the *large* capital money we would need. (.) If I were *able* to convince the top level administration, the president and the provost of the university that they had to support this program at a *higher* level, that's an obstacle I've *never* been successful in doing. Because we're already pretty well supported. I don't mean to sound like I'm complaining. In fact I feel fortunate and very *blessed*. To make it *closer* to perfection, a major new *budget* created by the university, and the realist in me says that the only way that would ever happen is *if* a truly major *donor* who was really *interested* in this specific aspect of our program were to make a *gift* of five million dollars to the piano pedagogy program, (.) which would *allow* us then to either build or rebuild the facility to be perfectly tailored. (N.n) And then time is the obvious obstacle. That's the thing that the students, the graduate students struggle with probably *more* than anything else. It's a *struggle* that in many ways mirrors the struggle that will continue all their life if they remain in this field. That is, the struggle between being a musician, being a teacher, being a scholar, and having a *life*. Now as their life moves on, you know, right here maybe it means having a social life, later it means having a spouse or a family, and finding time to balance those things. (.) If I could wave a wand so that one problem could go away, that would be the one.

R: My last question is, this question comes from some research suggesting that pedagogy degrees should combine with performance degrees, and some research suggests it should separate from performance degrees. In your idealized program, what kind of degree would you like to offer?

S: That's an argument I have with myself fairly *often*. If we look at it *historically*, it helps, because *originally* (.) they were *separate*. You could get a degree in piano performance. You could get a degree in piano pedagogy. In those days, piano pedagogy was frequently and *unfortunately* lower class. If you *weren't* good enough to be in performance, well you should get

the pedagogy degree. That may not have been the *intent* but it was often the reality. And then, (.) I think it was in the 80s really, that the notion that they really should be *combined, emerged* and then it took about 10 or 12 years for that to sort of wash through the system. So then a lot of degrees went to a combined program. That's what happened *here*, that's what happened at Northwestern and a *number* of schools, (.) and I think that was partly to try to *elevate* the status of the pedagogy student, by just not taking people into it that were really *unskilled* performers. And an attempt to gain more *credibility* within the performance community as well, (.) and I think the kind of difficulty that I'm talking about that we face here, that is students really *not* having time to really practice enough or prepare for their teaching *enough*, is sort of pushing people once again back toward a model in which they're at least available as separate degree programs. *Philosophically*, here is where I stand on the issue, (.) and I believe the solution we've arrived at here provides a *good* model. That is, a strongly *allied* performance and pedagogy program in a single degree, which does require *additional* hours. In an ideal world, might even allow for another year, a *third* year, or at least another term. (.) And that should be one pathway that one could follow. The other pathway is that master of music ed program, which is really a music education degree, but when it comes to, and so those people take the quantitative type of research courses. They take the educational psychology courses, (.) so that the person who really might have in the past done what is called piano pedagogy would do that degree, really a music ed degree, with the *content* area being *piano*, and that can be given *with or without* certification, depending on what the person intends to do eventually. I think that piano pedagogy offered on its own *through* a pedagogy professor or *through* a performance faculty is apt to be a weak program, because few if any of those people have the tools or the teeth that come from the music ed *research* commitment. So it goes, it kind of would be a *regression* to an era in which pedagogy was a weaker degree just for weaker performers. I'm afraid that's what would happen. I'm not saying that I haven't wished that I could take some students and just do piano pedagogy with them, but I think that that would be my solution. My opinion is that it should have one *foot* planted solidly in the performance world and that's the skills and practices, and it should have the other foot planted *solidly* in the music ed world. And *not* too many places are doing that, because pedagogy entered the academy as the *stepchild* of the performance program, and was taught by performers or former performers who didn't have the *educational background* and I think that's what led to that unbalanced status or that *lack* of status and if we could *arrive* at a point in which it really is one foot in *both worlds*, then that's the balance point that I *aspire* to. I aspire to that even in the pedagogy program. (N.n) you know, I think it should be equal *parts*, performance and pedagogy. With performance being one side and pedagogy being *music education* side, but music ed *directs* into the things unique to piano pedagogy. I wonder about something, (.) this is answering the same question from a *tangent*. Why don't we, for example, teach the first pedagogy class, well, here at my program, we have piano pedagogy, we have voice pedagogy, we have instrumental pedagogy. Now a *lot* of what those people need, I think, is *the same*, an understanding of how people learn. Why don't we teach them all *together*? And then have the second course be discipline *specific*, which would be piano repertoire, piano technique, bilateral coordination and those things. (N.n) If anyone's doing that sort of thing in this country, I haven't seen it. Then you really get the people who know their field the *best*. I almost feel like an imposter, when I try teach educational psychology. I try to do a couple classes::: Why *not* have a real expert to teach educational psychology and I can teach what I am really expert at which is *piano* pedagogy. I don't know. I think we should hold a conference about that, you know, *reconfigure* it again.

R: So, you talked about the combined degree at the masters level, how about for the bachelor's degree, is the same or :::?

S: Well here I'll *reveal* some of my prejudices, because I *really* tend to think the bachelor's degree should be a time when two things happen, when one attains a professional level of skill as a *musician*, in other words a bachelor of music and performance, and one becomes a well-educated, well-rounded *human being*, in other words *liberal arts* education. (.) And in my *ideal* world, those two things would happen and for the most part, the *need* for an undergraduate pedagogy degree doesn't exist in that world. They become a player and an educated person, and then at the masters level, that's when they really focus on pedagogy. Now, would they take courses at the undergraduate level? Yes, one or two courses, to get some experience, some exposure, I call it *exposure* as opposed to *experience*. So they begin to see *options* and begin to see if they're *interested* because, I don't think one should enter a graduate pedagogy degree to find out if you're interested in teaching, because if you're not interested at that point or you find out that you're not interested after you've been there for a year, you know, you've *wasted* a year. So I think you can find out, *discover* those interests as an undergraduate, but not necessarily *do* a degree. I like what we offer here. We offer an *emphasis* but not a degree at the undergraduate level. Now there's a *counterargument* to that, but this is not my opinion, it's just a counterargument, that we train public school music educators at the undergraduate level, you know they go through four, well in reality it's now five because there are so many requirements, but at the undergraduate level they get a bachelors degree, they get certified, and they enter the public schools and teach. Why *shouldn't* we be able to do that in *piano*? The practical response is, you *can*, and we *could*, but it *wouldn't* be ideal. Because what *happens* so often is that yeah, they have attained their credentials, they have *met* their requirements, but they're not very well educated, they haven't really *benefited* from the inquiry that goes with a liberal arts education, because they can't. They have to meet too many professional *requirements*. And 2, they're not likely to be as good a musician as they should be. Now there are always exceptions to that, and I'm not saying there aren't some incredibly wonderful public school teachers who get their bachelors degree and do a great job forever. (.) Just in an ideal world, I prefer to see that happening in bachelors followed by masters as well. So you can think of me as a dreamer or as living in the ivory tower, because the real world may *intervene* there. And I do think there should be some schools that do offer undergraduate degrees in piano pedagogy, I just *don't* want it to be mine.

R: Thank you so much.

Interview with Subject G

R: (Subject G), I'm glad to let you know that your piano pedagogy program has been selected as one of the top 20 piano pedagogy programs in the United States. Could you please think about what kind of characteristics made those people vote for your program as one of the top 20?

S: (N.n) I think that our school has *visibility* because it's a large research university, and it's well known for a *variety* of disciplines, and the school of music is respected in general. (.) But with regard to piano pedagogy in particular, I think (.) that I have *brought* visibility to our program through my *activities* in MTNA and the Keyboard Pedagogy Conference. (N.n) I've been attending those sessions for a *long* time, and you know, *presented* at the national level, and I've also *published* articles that I think people have noticed. So, (.) also I think our *graduates* have been pleased with their development while they were here, (.) you know, whether they go into *college* teaching or back to *private* teaching, and whether they're from the United States or from other countries, I think that after they graduate they speak *well* about our program, and so I think this is an attribute, probably, that has led *to* our selection in the top 20.

R: Congratulations, that's very nice. So you think the reputation of the school, and also being very *active* in the conference are the major *factors* that have contributed to this result?

S: [Yes.

R: Now I'd like to ask you about *curriculum* content in your program at the undergraduate and the graduate level.

S: (.) We don't offer an undergraduate degree or concentration in piano pedagogy. Even in piano performance right now, we have a *small* enrollment of undergraduate students. We have a *larger* enrollment of graduate students. (N.n) We offer the master of arts degree in piano *pedagogy* and the master of *music* degree in piano performance.

R: Do you offer degrees at the doctoral level?

S: *Yes*, we offer the DMA in piano performance, and the Ph.D. in music education with an emphasis in piano pedagogy.

R: So you said you *don't* have the degree for undergraduates, but do they take pedagogy courses?

S: Yeah, we have a *bachelor* of music in piano performance, and they are required to take two quarters of piano pedagogy.

R: Can you talk about those two first?

S: [Actually, they take the *same* course that the graduate students do. So, it's a 600 level course that students can be *either* graduate or undergraduate and be enrolled in that.

R: Can you talk about the *content* of what you teach in that?

S: In the course? (.) I, (.) let's see, well, (N.n) obviously we *survey* the repertoire, the teaching repertoire. What I try to develop in students is *analytical* skills before teaching skills, I make sure they know how to analyze music. So, whereas some pedagogy courses are structured according to *levels*, like beginning, intermediate, or advanced, or age group, I think I kind of structure the course according to *skills*, so (.) the first skill would be just *analyzing* scores, and then eventually analyzing technique by observing videotapes of master performers and analyzing teaching itself by *observing* other teachers, or master teachers, or by watching me teach. So, (.) I am kind of focus on those different *skill* areas all through the course. I do tend to change the course, *every year* (hhh), so I'm always revising the way I teach it and I *accommodate* the needs of the students that I'm working with. The course (.) tends to have, (.) it's fewer than *10* students

enrolled in the course, so it can be *flexible* enough that I can accommodate the needs of the students.

R: So are you the only *one* person in charge of the pedagogy program?

S: Yes.

R: And you say that students observe, watch you teaching, so mainly is it for a one-on-one setting, or also group teaching?

S: Primarily group teaching. *Class piano* for music majors.

R: Now I'd like to go back to *teacher training* a little bit more. How do your students get those teacher training experiences? (.) I mean, for the one-on-one setting or for group teaching. Do they mainly learn by *observing*, or do they also have a chance to teach?

S: They have a *chance* to teach. After they've taken the *core* course, then they can enroll in an internship course.

R: Is that included as part of the *required* courses?

S: For the *masters* degree in piano pedagogy, yes it's required.

R: So that's not included in the two quarters you talked about?

S: *No*, no, the undergraduates don't get that.

R: I see, so internships are mainly for the graduate students.

S: Right, and (.) the internship tends to be *primarily* for practice teaching in the applied setting, one-on-one, and those students teach music majors who take piano as a secondary instrument. (.) If the graduate students are *funded* as a graduate teaching associate, then they are assigned sections to teach in the class piano program, and I observe them teach there and *meet* with them for weekly planning sessions. So they get a lot of *instruction* in how to teach on the *job*, you know, if they're a teaching assistant.

R: But how about the undergraduate students? Mainly they learn those experiences through the courses?

S: [Right, the undergraduate students have an *option* to teach in the *preparatory* division, but that is administered separately from the piano pedagogy program.

R: So you do have a prep program? Department?

S: Yes, it's very small.

R: How small is it?

S: What's that? (.) Well actually, it's not (.) closely *coordinated* with the pedagogy program, it's like an *independent*.

R: You mean, they are not connected with the pedagogy program, they are independent, right? But the students have the *chance* to teach there?

S: Undergraduates. (.) Well, any students, any students. I don't select the teachers for the prep division, (N.n) but I select the teaching assistants for the, the graduate teaching associates in the *class piano* program.

R: I see, thank you. So, now I'd like to shift our topic a little bit. Talking about the instructors' degrees. In your ideal, what kind of degree, what kind of training is best for being a pedagogy instructor?

S: Well, the degree I have is the *Doctor* of music in piano performance and pedagogy. It's a degree that *integrates* applied study in performance with study in pedagogy, and I think that it prepared me well for the work that I do.

R: So you think being a pedagogy professor, the best degree is having a piano pedagogy and performance degree, right?

S: [Right, because I think it's *balanced*. It gives balanced *emphasis* to performance and pedagogy.

R: How about, can you talk about finances in your program?

S: (N.n) There's not a budget specifically (.) for the pedagogy program, there's not an *independent* budget. We do have a *technology* fee for the school of music, and for *maintenance* of the piano lab; you know, I just make *requests* for whatever I need in terms of technology. (.) In terms of materials, like, (.) repertoire for review, the *publishers* are very generous in providing some copies. (.) In terms of funding the graduate students for the, are you interested in that?

R: Yes, please.

S: (N.n) The school of music just has a certain number of assistantships to *offer* and (.) usually there are two assistantships assigned to the class piano program. At times those assistantships are *divided* or shared so that we *split* the *appointments* so that more students can get funding. They get *lower* levels of funding, but that way more people can get funding. So sometimes I have two fulltime GTAs, or sometimes I'll have four halftime GTAs or *various* combinations. And usually those students come from the *performance* area, but sometimes they also come from, (.) sometimes there are more *qualified* class piano teachers majoring in other degree programs, like sometimes *music education* or sometimes *musicology*.

R: Depends on individuals.

S: Yeah, right now I have a graduate assistant who is working on a musicology degree, but is very well qualified, she has a piano background and is *well* qualified for group teaching, so (N.n) we try to encourage people, when people have interest in *more* than one discipline, we try to encourage that. And I'm *always* just looking for the most well qualified teacher to work in the program.

R: You talked about technology earlier, could you please describe how technology is used in your program?

S: Well, (.) we have a Claver Nova lab with 16 pianos, (.) and we have a *separate* lab for *sequencing*, (.) with keyboards and computers for Finale and other forms of sequencing. So students learn sequencing technology in a special course called *Music Technology*. It's offered for undergraduates and graduates.

R: So that's not part of the pedagogy course, it's *separate*.

S: *Right*, it's separate, but we utilize technology in the pedagogy courses, you know, through the *communications* system and the accompaniment discs, and the rhythm tracks on the instructor's piano. (.) And my office has a Disclavier, so I give demonstrations on the Disclavier in my studio, we have *several* disklaviers available for students to use and (.) I assign projects where they record teaching repertoire on a disklavier so they get some experience in recording, and playback. (.) Also, we use a lot of *videotapes* in the core course, to view presentations on various topics. And also to *view* performances of outstanding performers, like there's a *collection* of performances, I think it's a Steinway celebration where various artists perform, and I use that as models of *technique* so that we analyze *movement*, so there's a lot of video technology.

R: Is there any particular software you use for teaching?

S: (N.n) No. We have, no.

R: OK, also, sorry, earlier you talked about curriculum, I'd like to know, do you have any particular *textbook* you use for the class?

S: Well, again, that changes. I often require students to purchase *Jane McGraw, The Guide to the Teaching Repertoire*, I also require students to *subscribe* to *Keyboard Companion*. I have

used, in the past, the Marianne Uszler text, *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher*. I've also used, at different times, there's the recent, the *A Symposium for Pianists and Teachers* by Seymour Fink and Gail Berenson.

S: OK. Thank you. You talked about curriculum, teacher training, technology, and finances in your program. Now (.) which one that we've discussed do you think is the largest challenge, or any other challenge you think is the largest challenge you're facing in your program?

S: The (.) primary challenge is to *structure* practice teaching opportunities.

R: (.) Why?

S: Because we're *limited* in how many assistantships we can offer to graduate students. And since our prep program is so small, it doesn't really function as a *lab* program, (N.n) so that's a *challenge*. (.) What, we have a workable solution in that we always have a *demand* for instruction of music majors who take piano as a secondary instrument, and I can assign *intern* teachers to teach them one-on-one. That's an ideal *pool* of *lab* students because they can enroll for a quarter or two or three, and then there's not such a responsibility for *continuity*. But, you know, (.) in teaching children, you have an obligation, if you start instruction that you are able to continue instruction, (.) and we don't really, we can't *meet* that obligation at our school right now.

R: So, if you could only *improve* one challenge at a time, which one would you improve immediately?

S: (N.n) I guess, (N.n) I guess I would *update* and *expand* our facilities because we have, we are limited in facilities, that's one reason we can't really expand our preparatory division, is we don't really have *space*.

R: So space is the issue you're facing?

S: *Facilities*, yes.

R: What kind of facilities are you talking about?

S: Well, the *building* itself, I would like to have a *room*, like, (.) a resource center where students could *browse* through educational materials, you know, like a *work* room. We *don't* really have that. My pedagogy courses are really divided among *three* buildings. One, the piano lab is in a classroom building that was built in the 1940s, and then my office is in a building that was built in the 1970s, and we're *restricted* on classroom space, and (.) the equipment that's in those classrooms, some of our best classroom space with *video playback* equipment is in the music library, which is in a separate building. So those, (.) like, having classes divided among *three* buildings on a big campus is a *challenge*.

R: It's hard to handle this. So, you think facility, space is the challenge. So, is there any chance that you can improve this in the future?

S: //Not by myself.

R: Is it on the way to improving, little by little at least?

S: Well, (.) the school of music has *requested* a new building, and the university is aware of that, but (.) *financing* for a new building for the school of music is, you know, (.) very *problematic*. It will require development funds from alumni, and we don't really have alumni who are, you know, (.) in a position to make those kinds of contributions.

R: OK, now I'd like to ask about your ideal piano pedagogy program. So, in your ideal, in your dream, what kind of ideal piano pedagogy would be in your vision?

S: Hmm, (.) that's a very broad question.

R: What kind of system, or what kind of degree, or what kind of curriculum, or what kind of facility would you dream about if you were going to build a piano pedagogy program.

S: I think (.) that I would have two *separate* keyboard labs, and an adjoining workspace.

R: What do you mean by two separate keyboard labs?

S: Well, so that we can *offer* more sections, more space for *group* teaching. And, I would have, nearby, (.) a classroom that is *equipped* with video playback equipment. (N.n) I would like to have a lab that has *LCD* projectors in it for projecting computer images. Right now we have an overhead projector, but it's not an LCD projector. I think we'll get that *soon*. (N.n) Idealized piano, (N.n) Well, I guess to reach my ideal, better *facilities* would be the best thing.

R: So, in this picture, in this *dream*, what kind of obstacles do you see, if you were going to build up this program?

S: Well, primarily it's financial (hhh).

R: So do you have any *possible* solution for this?

S: (.) I would say strong support. I think (.) it *requires* a different budget model for the whole university, (.) we're kind of *restricted* by the way our school is funded from the university. And I think the *arts* require special consideration and funding, so there would need to be *revision* in the budget model. (N.n) I just have a thought, maybe to go backwards.

R: Yes, please.

S: And this relates, I think, actually, to your first question, of what makes it a *strong* program. I think it's a strong program in that we have a lot of *international* students, and there's a lot of opportunity for *cross-cultural* training, and I kind of *use* that as an *enhancement* to education.

R: What do you mean, cross-cultural training?

S: (.) I'm very *aware* that some of our students come from other countries, and (.) I think in some ways our training is very *specific* to American students, but (.) they're gonna take this training and go to other countries where it might not be so *adaptable* or *applicable*, and so I think, we have to develop, while we develop teaching techniques, we also have to develop sensitivity to the *context* of culture in which we train. So, along with that, though, (.) I just wanted to say that our university is set in a particularly advantageous environment in that (city) is a major city with a lot of *cultural advantages*. (.) I think students can draw from all the advantages of a very large institution in a big city that's not as big as New York, or Chicago, or Los Angeles, you know, it's large *enough* without, but still *manageable* enough. And we also have an excellent *community* of piano teachers in the area that are very supportive of our program, so that is a big enhancement.

S: Can I know how many pedagogy students are enrolled in your program right now?

S: (.) I usually have about *four* in the masters program, and there are *no* students, currently, in the Ph.D. program. (.) But a lot of the students who are in the performance degrees take the pedagogy courses, a lot of the *DMA* students take pedagogy courses even though they're not majoring in pedagogy.

R: OK, so my last question is, you know how some research suggests that pedagogy degrees should *separate* from performance degrees, and some research suggests that they should combine together. In your opinion, in your idealized program, what kind of degree would you offer for different levels? Could you please describe that?

S: The *more* integrated the better. (.) What we have here, especially at the doctoral level, are very *specialized* degrees. We have the DMA in performance and we have the Ph.D. in music education and they are *extremely* specialized, and I think they are *overly* specialized. (.) I think the degree that I had as a student was more appropriate, was more helpful, or more *practical*. A degree that *combines* performance and pedagogy is more useful.

R: So even for a bachelors degree?

S: (N.n) No, I don't think so. I think at the bachelors level, (.) no, (.) I think a performance degree is most *useful* at that level.

R: Uh huh, why?

S: So that students can really *focus* on performance before focusing on teaching. I know the *problem* there is that not all students go on for graduate work. I don't know, I guess I haven't thought much about the undergraduate because our *focus* is more on the graduate. (.) But I just think it's important to focus on *playing* well.

R: Right, but they take pedagogy courses, right?

S: Yeah.

R: But on the *upper* levels, you think that combined, integrated degrees are better than separate?

S: *Yes*. I just wanted to let you know, (.) we require, for the masters degree, a course in keyboard harmony, you know, which is *functional* skills.

R: You mean, functional skills are *part* of the coursework?

S: Yes, (.) it's a required course in the pedagogy program, so I guess, I have a core course in piano pedagogy, but (.) I don't *attempt* to teach everything in that one course. The whole curriculum is *integrated*.

R: So you are the only one person in charge of the entire program, right?

S: Yes, (.) so I supervise the class piano program and the pedagogy.

R: I see. It must be very busy.

S: Oh (hhh), yes.

R: I can imagine that.

S: Thank you for all your answers. That's very nice and useful.

R: You are welcome.

Interview with Subject H

R: (Subject H) thank you for your interview today. I'd like to let you know that your piano pedagogy program has been selected as one of the *top 20* piano pedagogy programs in this country by a group of people. Could you talk about what kind of *characteristics* you think have made your program be selected?

S: I think one of the characteristics we *value* very strongly here is a combination of very *strong* performance skills as well as very *strong* teaching skills. So we *really* encourage our pedagogy students and work with them as closely as possible to help develop their performance side as well as their observation and their teaching component.

R: So you think the major characteristics are the performance and pedagogy combination and also.

S: //And collaborative teaching opportunities between different *departments* within the school of music

R: That's neat. So how big is your pedagogy program, how many students?

S: I would estimate right now between, around 15, 15 to 20.

R: That's *big*.

S: That includes masters and doctoral students.

R: So you have a pedagogy degree offered for bachelors, masters and doctoral?

S: We have an *emphasis* at the undergraduate degree, then we have a *masters* degree in piano pedagogy that has either a *thesis* track or a *recital* track, and then we have a Doctor of Musical Arts degree in piano pedagogy, which has either a *recital* track or a *dissertation* track.

R: What do you mean by recital track and dissertation track?

S: (.) if I were comparing degrees, the recital track would be more like a performance and pedagogy degree where they do *recitals* and a *paper* at the end. The dissertation track would be more like a *Ph.D.*, only with just a Doctor of Musical Arts in pedagogy instead.

R: And the students get the chance to choose which track they want to go, right?

S: Well it's *usually* in combination of their *choice* and faculty *recommendation* when they audition. (.) Although, I do have a masters student right now who initially wanted the recital track but she's decided she would like to do both, so she's going to write a thesis as well. (N.n) I'm very pleased with her progress.

R: Could you please talk about the curriculum content in your program from the undergraduate all the way to the doctoral?

S: [For the undergraduate it's required that *all* students, *all* piano students take a *two* semester pedagogy sequence.

R: Even the performance majors?

S: Yes, it's required, and then the students who are on the pedagogy emphasis, they take the two semester sequence of courses. What I did not say is that there is also a *laboratory* teaching component, which goes along with those two courses as well, so the pedagogy emphasis people are required to do a *third* semester of student teaching.

R: What kind of target of students do they teach for the undergraduate students? You say student teaching, so what age of students do the pedagogy students *teach*?

S: I think it *depends* upon the level of *maturity* of the class. Usually it's private, we have done group teaching as well, and this year we did an experiment where the undergraduate students were *paired* with a graduate student *mentor*, so I worked with them in class on their lesson plans

and their teaching techniques, (.) and then they also were assigned to do specific teaching projects underneath these graduate mentors so they had much more *feedback* and a much more broad perspective. And the students were *very*, very pleased with the experience.

R: So for the undergraduate students, the first two semesters they take coursework, and in the third and fourth semesters they focus on student teaching, right?

S: The student teaching is *concurrent* with the course work, so there's just that *extra* semester for the pedagogy emphasis.

R: [I see. So they're mainly teaching one-on-one, or group teaching?

S: We do group and one-on-one.

R: Both? And could you talk about graduate students?

S: (.) Coursework is *pretty* much the same for the masters and the doctoral degrees, which is pretty common. So we have a two semester, pedagogy course sequence, (.) and then I also teach specialized courses. We have one that's required, that is pedagogy of *group* piano, which has everything to do with college level group teaching, and then I do specialized seminars as well. One of those that I've taught in the past was teaching piano pedagogy, which was exploring everything to do with pedagogy from a *faculty* perspective, and the students had to learn *how* to actually teach the undergraduate students. I also teach a graduate pedagogy *seminar* that's completely on *improvisation*, from the beginning to the advanced levels. (.) And then, also, we have piano pedagogy and literature, which is basically a graduate literature seminar on things like Chopin, Liszt, Beethoven. But then we do *incorporate* advanced pedagogical discussions on style, technique, how you communicate these types of things to a student, and how you *build* their repertoire and build their skill level so they can approach, let's say, the Waldstein Sonata or something like that.

R: That's neat. So how many courses do they have to take as graduate students?

S: Courses are all on a *rotation*, (N.n) so there are three pedagogy courses required, which are the two semester sequence and the pedagogy of group piano, (.) a literature is also required.

R: So if students go from the masters degree to the doctoral degree, is there any difference, different courses or many *similar* courses they can take?

S: They're pretty much the *same*. I usually encourage my masters students to go to other schools so they can get a *broad*er perspective, and they can get other ideas and *more* and different teaching experience to help prepare them better for the job market. (.) And of course all of them do group teaching and private teaching through our *preparatory* program and in many, many schools and academies here in the city.

R: So, for teachers, I'd like to go back to the teacher training part in a little bit more depth. So mainly, they learn those (.) one-on-one, private teaching and group teaching through the courses, right? And also for the graduate student they are teaching assistants for the preparatory program?

S: Yes, (.) they *teach* in the preparatory program, and then most of them are also graduate assistants teaching class piano as well, *college* level class piano. And then we have developed quite a few *relationships* with piano *academies* and schools and studios here in town, so almost all of my graduate students are out teaching professionally outside of the school as well, and we work *very*, very hard to try and get them as much professional experience as possible *outside* of the university.

R: Yes, and you mentioned about the prep department, how big is the preparatory department?

S: It's *fairly* small, right now, the enrollment tends to run between 30 and 35 for piano, and we *do* keep it that small specifically because a lot of the private teachers here in the area are *very*

good friends of the school of music and the university, and we don't want to *compete* with them. Because they're *very*, very good to us as far as offering opportunities for *workshops* to our students.

R: Thank you. So, when you mentioned, you encourage students to go to another school for their doctoral degree, I'd like to ask you from your own opinion, since your school seems to offer a variety of different degrees, for being a pedagogy instructor, what *type* of degree do you think is the best for being a college level pedagogy teacher?

S: (N.n) That's a *tough* question. Because one of the things I hear back from many of our students is that they really like the fact that we were able, to *tailor* our doctoral degree for their specific interests and then also to fill in any *holes* that they may have, so usually, if a masters student wants to go on, we really look around to try to find a program that will best *fit* their interests and will help build the strengths that they have. (.) And so I can't say that there's any specific degree, it's *more* building their professional degree.

R: I understand. So DMA or Ph.D. doesn't matter, can I say that?

S: I don't think so. (.) We do work *very*, very hard if we have a student who is more interested in a Ph.D. area to be sure that they are *publishing* and that they are doing workshops. Like one of our recent graduates who just graduated last year with his dissertation, he has presented at the national meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music, at the *national* meeting of the College Music Society, and also at the Great Lakes, the Northeast, the Mid-Atlantic divisions of the College Music Society, and then he's done workshops throughout Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee, and South Carolina, and also has an article that will be coming out in *Clavier*, so we're very proud of him. And *that's* what I want to see for our graduates. I don't want them to be here in school so much, as I want them to be *developing* themselves professionally, and most of them do; most of them are presenting and doing *great* work.

R: So now you've talked about the curriculum and the faculty background training, I'd like to know about your program's finances. How do the finances distribute to your program, and how do you get the funding to support your program? Could you talk about this please?

S: A lot of our funding for extra things comes from the *preparatory* program, that goes into an account. And then also we have quite a number of *graduate assistantships* in class piano and in piano accompanying. So, along with the graduate assistantships there are a *number* of what our graduate college calls tuition *supplements*, and those are kind of like stipends that are added on to the graduate assistantships as part of the financial package.

R: Thank you. Now, how is technology used in your program?

S: We have a very strong music technology center here, and our students learn about things like Music Ace and all kinds of software that is available to be use. Of course, they learn how to huse the *laboratory* system. (.) Other courses that are offered by other faculty here at the school include beginning to advanced *web* design. And also courses in *sequencing*. And so it's very open as far as what their interests are and what things they want to *pursue*. One of our doctoral students did create an interactive internet tutor to go along with Alfred basic piano library, the first level, and it had QuickTime movies, PowerPoint presentations, and things. (.) So most of our students are involved in some aspect of that type of thing.

R: So in your coursework, do you mainly teach them how to utilize that technology or does it depend on.

S: //We usually don't do it through the coursework, it's usually *pursued*, I do all of the *advising*, so I advise them to take one of these extra courses, and then we work closely with that faculty

member to see that our student is doing a *specific* project that they can spend an entire semester on instead of just maybe a two week project, so that they get more out of the experience.

R: So you mean an extra technology course through the same department, or from another?

S: //It's in the music department. We have faculty who have *specializations* in computer music and in web design, and many of our students do take those courses. I just feel it's *better* that they spend *much* more time going more in depth, not technology for technology's sake but with a real, deep, *pedagogical* understanding of the implications and the uses of it. That might be better than just hitting it for two weeks in a course.

R: Now, sorry, I'd like to go back, I forgot to ask you about the curriculum a little bit. Do you have any particular *textbooks* you use for your courses?

S: (.) Our undergraduates, we use a combination of the Bastien, *How to Teach Piano Successfully*, I have used that in the past, although recently I've gone more to using *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher*, and then also the Francis Clark *Questions and Answers*. I do *require* those for the undergraduate level. For the graduate level, we use *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher*, the Francis Clark, *Questions and Answers*, and the *Symposium for Pianists and Teachers*, (.) and then also a *supplemental* reading list like *Creative Piano Teaching* by James Lyke and other authors. Our improvisation class is non-text based. It's all *improvised*, all the time.

R: You must be very good at that.

S: I'm afraid some of my students get a lot better than *I* am. Sometimes I get a little embarrassed towards the end of the course because they develop so well.

R: That's nice. So do you also have workshops for improvisation?

S: I do a teacher's workshop for beginning improvisation, but then the course comes up about every *other* year.

R: I see. (.) So do you go out to different states or conferences, with the workshop?

S: I've given it quite a few times here and another state. I think it's a very important thing, and the doctoral student I was telling you about, who's done all the presentations, he did his doctoral dissertation on improvisation within the group piano curriculum, and it was quite interesting, the results.

R: Thank you so much. Now we've talked about all the different aspects of your program, do you see, which one is the largest challenge you are *facing* in your program?

S: (N.n) Oh, I think *always* observation and feedback.

R: Why?

S: There's just a *limited* amount of time, and a limited amount of bodies, and we're trying to give our students meaningful *feedback* and as much as possible. I think that's one of the reasons that we've gone so *much* to have them work out in the *community* is that they just have more chances for more people to give them as much feedback as possible.

R: So that's mainly about time consuming?

S: It's a time issue, (.) and I feel that it's *so* important. They actually bring their videos *into* class, and we watch them *together* and discuss them, and the other students get to *weigh* in with commentary as well.

R: OK, and if you had the chance to improve the challenges you were facing one at a time, which one would you like to deal with first, *immediately*?

S: Creating many more, and many *more* varied intern teaching opportunities and experiences, as many different *types* as possible. (.) I don't think you can ever have enough, or enough different types.

R: Provide more *opportunities* for student teaching, thank you. So my next research question is that I would like to know about your personal view of the future ideal piano pedagogy program. If you were going to build the idealized piano pedagogy program, what type of program would you dream about?

S: How does piano pedagogy really see itself at the *doctoral* level. Does it see itself as a *research* discipline, a *teaching* discipline, or a *performance* discipline, and how are we going to balance those things? So I guess that doesn't really answer your question, but I think those are the *issues* that we're kind of grappling with.

R: So, in your ideal program, how would you *construct* those issues, how would you balance those, and value performance?

S: (.) I think we're *very* lucky here in that our applied faculty are very *committed* to the teaching end as well, and so every year I *revise* my coursework. I think we're moving to *more* of a little less coursework, and *a lot* more actual teaching experience and feedback.

R: So you mean you would reduce a little bit of the portion?

S: Yes, we're reducing a little bit of the *subject* matter that maybe isn't necessary in a pedagogy course, and doing *a lot* more observation with *a lot* more feedback, in class and outside of class.

(.) And then, of course, we *encourage* our students to perform as much as *possible*. Even if they desire the dissertation, I still encourage them to play a recital.

R: And, how would you value the performance in your program?

S: We consider it to be the same, whether you are *in* the DMA in performance degree or in the DMA in piano pedagogy. (.) We expect a high level of performance from *everyone*. Of course, we realize that the people in the pedagogy degree are spending a little bit less time practicing and *more* teaching, but we still expect them to perform whatever they're doing at the *highest* level possible.

R: So in your picture, the ideal dream here, if you were going to build up this program, would you see any possible obstacles you could face? Do you understand what I mean?

S: (N.n)Yes, funding and money. That's always, *always* a challenge, and you've probably heard that from everyone else you've talked to. (.) I think if I were to go back to my ideal pedagogy program, would be that there would be no difference between the DMA performance and the DMA in piano pedagogy, they would be the *same*, and it would be an *intensive* degree that perhaps lasted a bit *longer* and incorporated both aspects *into* it.

R: So you think that *money* affects those issues?

S: *Yes*, developing, you know, *relationships* that are going to pay off down the road. We've already some good success with that here. (.) And then, also, those relationships that I mentioned before with the teachers in the community. I consider them, in *many* ways, to be our pedagogy faculty as well. (.) The students will get more real *life* information and experience from them, than they will in the so-called *Ivory Tower* of the university. Those teachers are out there doing the real work every day, so I really *do* consider them to be pedagogy faculty.

R: That's neat; they are very helpful and useful.

S: *Absolutely*, and they've encountered *every* problem you could imagine.

R: Yes, they are *really* experienced in true life. OK, my last question is: now, I know you have different degrees in your program, you offer a variety of degrees, and in *your* idealized program, what kind of degree would you offer, and why do you think this is best?

S: (N.n) I think a *marriage* between performance and pedagogy, I can understand why research would say that it's not the best way to go, but then you have to look at the *reality*. (.) And, in the job market today, almost *no* one is going to make it *completely* as a performer. There's only

room for one Martha Argerich in the profession, and so everyone is going to make their living in one way or another, in *full* or in *part* from teaching, and it's really the *future* of the profession. And if a pianist does not know *how* they do what they do (.) and *how* to communicate that to another person, then it will be the end. (.) Piano playing will eventually just disappear. (.) Because we can write about it as much as we want, but in the end, nobody *really* learns to play the piano from a book. It's knowledge that is passed in an oral and an aural tradition from one person to the next, so I think we *all* need to (.) accept that charge of learning to figure out *how* we do what we do and how to *communicate* that to another person.

R: So in your program, you think that a *combined* degree would be better?

S: //Yes, and this is what my students *hate* hearing from me the most, the dreaded *how* to. Whenever they answer a question, I always follow it up with, "That's great, but *how* do you do it?" They *hate* hearing that (hhh). Because then they have to figure out *how* they do what they do, or *how* we do what we do.

R: Yes. So, how would you do this *combined* degree?

S: Well I think we're doing a *very*, a pretty good job of it right now. And just in the pedagogy area demanding a *high* level of performance. Having gone through a national *search* and looking at the *files* specifically of people in piano pedagogy, I have to say, the playing level was not very *strong*, and could be *stronger*.

R: Yes. So you think that this kind of combined degree is the best for all the three different levels, like bachelors, masters, and doctoral, or any *differences* between that?

S: (.) Well, undergraduates, they are there to *absorb* as much as possible and to get some teaching experience, and *a lot* of them don't know quite what they want to do yet. (.) At the masters level and doctoral graduate level, as you know, we're providing professional experience, so your playing ability is really your calling card, (.) and then you need to be able to *back* that up with skills that are going to sustain you throughout a career, and *teaching* is one of those, one of the main things.

R: So you think, sorry, I have to make this clear, you think that this combined degree is good for all three levels or *just* for the graduate level, you know what I mean?

S: Oh, I think it primarily is *combined* at the undergraduate level, because most programs, require the pedagogy of *all* the piano majors. (.) But then at the graduate level, I think a combination of as *high* a level of performance as you can attain, (.) or demanding a high *level* of performance, (.) and *also* a high level in teaching ability, at least in this *country* is very important.

R: Thank you so much.

Interview with Subject I

R: (Subject I), thank you for your interview today. I really appreciate it, and I would like to let you know that your piano pedagogy program has been selected as one of the top 20 US university programs. Could you think of the reasons why people voted, the *characteristics* that made people vote for your school as the top 20?

S: How did you do that, I'm just curious? Could you tell me who the target population was for the survey? How did you go about deciding on the top 20?

R: First of all, I invited the *participants* of the GP3 2002, those people are my participants to *vote* for the top 20 they consider in their mind. Your school was selected, *recommended* as one of the top 20, one of the highest ranking. So those 20 piano pedagogy programs, the leaders in charge of the piano pedagogy program are my subjects for my study.

S: Of course I can't say why people *picked* (our school), but I am delighted that we were picked! Now, I'm just speculating, but there are probably three or four reasons why we were selected as a top program. I think *any* program is in part revered because of the *faculty* in the program and our program always has had an excellent faculty. Not just the faculty *now*, but the faculty *historically*, and you probably know this, but my predecessor, (person) was here for approximately four decades. (Person) was here for many years until he went to (school). (Person), who is now at (school), was also on our faculty. Truly, there is a tradition of having *excellent, visible* faculty. And the other thing I think we have, perhaps more than any other school, is the number of faculty lines. In the 60s and 70s we had *four* full-time faculty members identified as in the Piano Pedagogy Division.

R: Oh, that's a lot compared to other schools.

S: In terms of faculty lines, presently it's at 2.5 faculty positions (not counting TA positions), so we are a little *less* now. But, the quality of the faculty is important.

R: Quality and quantity both.

S: That's one of the reasons. And then of course, the second reason would be, I think we've had real *success* over time placing our students in positions. I can go through four decades of students who have gone through this degree program who are now in *leadership* positions. For example, (person) is a graduate of this program, he did his masters here, and I could point to many, *many* people who have graduated from (school). And then, a third issue is that we were one of the first schools to have *official* degree programs in piano pedagogy. Our degrees go back, our undergrad, and masters, and doctoral minor, they all go back to the *late 70s*, and when you look at when schools were starting to *develop* and put through pedagogy curricula, we were probably one of the first schools to do that, and many other schools followed suit. So probably, those three things. Also, the faculty, not just now, but over *time*, the faculty has been very *visible* in the field and has been leaders in the field. So that's what I would probably say about number one. Did I answer everything, do you have any questions?

R: Yes, yes, very clear. So I can say faculty, successful alumni, and traditional degrees are the factors that *contributed*?

S: Yes.

R: Can I ask you about, you have a *major* through all of the different degrees in piano pedagogy, right, through the bachelors, masters, and doctoral?

S: Yes, we have *three* different degree levels in place.

R: Now I'd like you to talk about the *content* of your curriculum.

S: The first point I would make is that each level, undergrad, masters, doctorate, each one *strives* for a different goal. For example, I feel at the undergraduate level, students should be given their *first* teaching experiences, but they also should be learning how to *play*, and how to be good musicians, all the things you *strive* for as an undergraduate. I *suspect* that what we do at any given level, whether it's undergrad or masters or doctorate, it's probably *similar* to other programs. At the undergrad level we do it a little differently than most schools, we actually have what we call an *open* studies program, whereas we used to have our undergrad. pedagogy major through the *music ed.* area. Now we have a bachelors of music and it's through open studies. The open studies curriculum allows a student to *structure* his or her own program. So with each undergrad pedagogy student, the final course selection may be slightly different. One student at the undergrad level may want to do more emphasis in business for example through the business college. Another student might want to *teach* or play more. We have a *core* that we want people to complete, but it's really nice because the undergrads can *tailor* the degree to their interests. We do meet NASM guidelines for undergraduate pedagogy. Undergraduate piano pedagogy majors take *two* semesters of pedagogy followed by a *year* of practicum. At the masters level, we're really preparing people to enter the profession at some level. The masters degree is *very* important because not all students go on for a *doctorate*, so by the time they finish the masters we really want them to be *well prepared* as teachers and players. Approximately *half* of our students go on for doctoral work. Doctoral work is really another issue *entirely*. At the doctoral level, I think the main thing is that students need to understand *curriculum*. *How* to build curricula and how to put curricula in place. So the doctoral level is about attaining *very* strong leadership skills in terms of being able to *develop* a program. And we have coursework that supports that direction. Some of the distinguishing things about our *curriculum* compared to other programs, is that we have a *very* refined college group piano program, and the classes are *small*. We limit our class size to eight. That's the *model* that Raymond Burrows, from Columbia talks about in his writings, developing musicianship skills in small groups. From a curricular *viewpoint*, so many schools are stuck with large piano labs—often it is a situation that just was not well thought out. Sometimes it has been by *accident* or because an administrator wants to have large classes to increase instructional units. We also have a children's program that we call the Piano Laboratory Program. So at all levels, students are teaching and observing, and getting *hands on* experience.

R: So could you talk more about the focus on the teaching experience that you offer students? How is it *different* between the bachelors, masters, and doctoral? Are they similar, or different?

S: They are *different*, but there are also similarities. First of all, we *separate* undergrad pedagogy course work from the graduate pedagogy courses. Undergraduates participate in guided teaching practicums whereas graduate students participate in *teaching internships* as part of the graduate curriculum. At the doctoral level, students do more *independent* work, where we can structure the teaching experience to focus on *weaknesses*. At the doctoral level, people come in with varying *backgrounds*. Some people may have, for example, more experience teaching college group piano, other people may have *less* experience teaching at the pre-college. In summary, at the doctoral level we really *refine* the teaching experience for each student, at the masters level we do teaching *internships* that are part of the courses, and likewise, and at the undergrad level we have teaching *practicums*.

R: But are they mainly for private lessons, or group lessons, college-class piano?

S: There are two levels of that, *actually* three areas. College group piano, and then teaching *children* in private lessons and in groups, both of those areas. And then at the doctoral level, we also focus on college-applied teaching, as well.

R: Thank you. So you're talking about *doctoral* students, that they get experience in applied teaching. In your opinion, what type of training, or should I say what type of degree, do you think is the *best* for being a future piano pedagogy faculty?

S: That's an *interesting* question. Your question implies a *terminal* degree, but I want to answer that differently. I don't think it's just about the *terminal* degree. I think a person teaching pedagogy, should probably have a mix of degrees. It might be the combination of a music education degree, piano pedagogy degree and performance degree or mix of pedagogy/performance. Ideally, the individual should possess a wide range of teaching and performing experiences and varied perspectives. In some ways, the ideal is that the undergrad and masters be a *mix* of music education and performance with greater focus on piano pedagogy at the masters and doctoral levels.

R: But you don't think pedagogy should be all straight forward, through all the levels. It's not necessary, right?

S: I think it is *healthy* to have a mix so that a person might have, out of their degrees, one performance degree. But I *do* think the terminal degree at the doctoral level should be a *Ph.D. or Ed.D. in piano pedagogy*, or a DMA mixing piano pedagogy with performance. I don't think it is necessary that all degrees, undergraduate through doctorate be only piano pedagogy. I like to see a *mix* reflecting teaching and musical diversity. I will add that a person hired for a piano pedagogy faculty position, in addition to be an excellent musician, should be very well versed in teaching piano pedagogy and piano related topics masterfully and totally at ease in a wide variety of settings (children, adults, group, private, etc.) including mentoring students in their teaching.

R: Now I'd like to shift our topic a little bit to *finance*. How are finances distributed to your program, and do you get those funds?

S: When you say finances, in our program, there are *two* possibilities. One is our Piano Laboratory Program, and that generates thousands of dollars in tuition. The Piano Laboratory Program is our *pre-collegiate* program, mostly children and some adults, but the way we do that is all the *tuition* that parents pay for lessons, all that money goes into a special *account*, and we keep track of that account, and then, the pedagogy department can *use* that account to *buy* things for the program. Or if we want to have someone come in and do a *master* class with the kids, if we need to buy *materials* for the group classes, or if we need to buy music for our summer program, anyway, that is an account that we *directly* control. That is one source of funds. The other type of financing is the financing that is through the *academic* unit, and for that we have to work through the *director's* office like anybody else. We *don't* have the final say over such awards, for example, how many teaching assistants we have or how many tuition waivers or fellowships. That's all done through the director's office. Of course we advise, urge, etc. and make every effort to receive the types of awards that we need.

R: Is the faculty in the laboratory your teaching assistants?

S: The teaching assistants we have are appointed through the school of music, they are not *appointed* through the Piano Laboratory Program.

R: But do they teach in the laboratory program?

S: *Yes*, they do. Normally they teach *three* college group classes, and some lessons in the Piano Laboratory Program.

R: For those teachers, are they your graduate students, or possibly *undergraduate* students also?

S: At the undergraduate level, for students to teach they must have minimally a year of piano pedagogy. At the graduate level (whether pedagogy or performance), if someone comes in with little teacher training we *don't* let him or her teach right away, they have to get some background. This happens often with our *international* students, where they have no background. We basically require *a* year of pedagogy before any student can teach in our Piano Laboratory Program. As far as teaching assistantship appointments, students must have a strong teaching background to be considered for an appointment.

R: And then you decide if they can teach or not, right?

S: Actually, most of our graduate assistants are *second* year students in the program, so they've already had a year of pedagogy. Let me mention one other thing. Sometimes we have been able to *appoint* a TA specifically to teach in the Piano Laboratory Program. In this situation, the TA *teaches lessons and classes only* in the Piano Laboratory Program, and the salary is funded *from* the Piano Laboratory Program. But that's unusual. Most of our assistants, again, are appointed *through* the school of music and that is a separate budget line.

R: Could you please talk about the technology in your program?

S: Yes. I'd say four areas that we focus on, one is *spreadsheet* technology, and you can use spreadsheets for *grading*. You can use it for *tracking* finances in a private studio, but spreadsheet technology. Another category, different from that, is *recording*, using Disklaviers or Clavinovas for sequencing. And then a third category is *evaluating instructional software*, software that you might use in teaching. A fourth is making students aware of long distance learning possibilities. For this, I have, on occasion, held long distance learning sessions with other campuses using Internet2 capabilities.

R: Is there any particular software you *prefer* to use?

S: I've got a *huge* list, and we have many software programs, so it is hard to identify favorites. Teachers can use programs depending on need and level. There are programs for *ear training*. There are programs for learning notes. There are programs for intervals. There are many, many different kinds of programs. So the general technology categories are recording and sequencing, spreadsheet technology, long distance learning, and evaluation of software.

R: So you teach your students how to use that technology through the *coursework*, right?

S: Yes, and I give assignments to them that they have to turn in. As an example, we just finished a spreadsheet assignment. Students had to do a *fictitious* spreadsheet showing how they would grade a piano class using spreadsheet technology. So it's *all* tied to doing assignments, and by doing assignments, I know they've mastered the issues. They also have to turn in a *disk* at the end of the semester where they have to take a piece and record *six tracks*, and for 99 percent of the students, they've not done this before.

R: Thank you. So we've talked about the issues of technology, finance, and curriculum; which *one* do you see, if you had to mention one, which do you think is the largest challenge you are facing in your program?

S: Well, it doesn't really come from your questions, but the *biggest* issue for many programs, including our program is not getting cuts. Seriously, we need enough TAs and tuition wavers to attract the best students to campus and to cover all the teaching bases. Many schools are in the same boat. If you don't have the tuition *wavers* and you don't have the assistantships, you can't *attract* students. And still, people come here and they have no financial aid and they have to pay for it. I think the sort of *day-to-day* things that we need to get, we do that through the piano lab program, and that's not a problem. The piano lab program will *always* be there, and it generates plenty of money for day-to-day expenses that we would need. The other big issue is *faculty lines*.

When a faculty member retires that we keep the position defined as piano pedagogy, and that the position is not eliminated or allocated to another instructional area. This has been a *major* problem nationally in the piano pedagogy field. I can name person after person, when they've retired, administrators and/or search committees have eliminated the position or redefined the duties for another area.

R: Why did they close positions?

S: Oh! That's another conversation for another day, but I think the retention of piano pedagogy faculty lines *nationally* and also maintaining an adequate number of teaching assistants is *absolutely* crucial. *Absolutely* essential.

R: So if you could only improve one challenge at a time, which one do you think you would like to improve *immediately*?

S: Actually in *terms* of the *program*, I would probably say there's actually not that *much* that I feel we need to improve in the curriculum, perhaps a couple *more* courses at the doctoral level, but that's a curricular issue.

R: What kind of courses?

S: Instead of teaching some course topics under generic course numbers, such as "workshop in music education", I would argue to create specific titles and course numbers for topics such as "Directed Readings in Piano Pedagogy". I do the same type of course now but it is under a *generic* title called Pro-seminar. There are a couple of topics I teach frequently, and I would rather those topics have their own *course titles and numbers*. So that's one issue. The other issue is I would say, just increased and/or stable *funding*, which goes to my previous comments.

R: *Yes*, money is always a big issue.

S: And we do *OK*, but actually the other thing, a *third* branch if I were dreaming, would be some type of *endowment* for piano pedagogy. We would have an endowment that would fund and be dedicated to *just* the pedagogy program. Again, that's a long-term issue. Many university units have endowed chairs, etc. but not funds directed to assist a *particular* program. So on the nuts and bolts level, it would be additional curriculum development, stable and/or increased funding, and on a *wish list*, an endowment that would *fund* piano pedagogy on this campus.

R: Let's go to my *second* research question for your own vision, your dream of an ideal piano pedagogy program. If you were going to build up your ideal piano pedagogy program, what kind of picture would you dream about?

S: It's a little bit difficult to answer because you can dream, but how *realistic* is that?

R: Right, and I want to see your dream and then also the realistic part.

S: You know, I would *broaden* that a little bit and *tackle* it from a little bit of a different direction. I think *actually* our pedagogy program at the University is *very* well developed, very well *thought out*, because we've had it in place for a *long* time. But in terms of an idealistic viewpoint, I guess I would say that for all music schools, that there be not *just* piano pedagogy degree programs, but there be *music pedagogy* programs.

R: Talk about that more.

S: When you look at other areas in higher education music schools, *most* disciplines or areas do not have *developed pedagogy*. You might have one pedagogy course, say in strings or voice, etc., but this is what I am getting at. Instead of having a remarkably developed undergraduate piano pedagogy program, why not have an undergraduate *music pedagogy program*, in which *any discipline* can participate. You could have a piano track; you could have a string track, a vocal track. I think that's the *future*. I was just talking with one of my colleagues on the voice faculty, and she said, "I want to do with voice what you've already done in piano. We *need* that *ALL* our

students are going to be teachers.” So what I’m *arguing* here is that we have a *bigger* vision. That it not just be piano pedagogy, but that it be pedagogy for all instruments, and that you structure it at the undergrad level and the masters level and the doctoral level, so any student coming in to a *masters* degree program, could select music pedagogy, and the focus could be on *piano*, or *voice*, or *strings*. I think that’s the next *big step*. This approach *draws* more faculty members *into the notion of teacher training* (not just piano pedagogy and music education which are old hands at it). It would promote a *broader* range of understanding across the faculty. I think *one* of the problems with piano pedagogy as a *discipline*, it’s a very, I don’t want to use the word small, but when you look at many schools, the *only* pedagogy programs are the piano pedagogy programs often run by only one faculty member, so that makes it *hard* for others to appreciate all that is involved because they aren’t *participating* actively. So, to answer your question, an *idealized* program would *not* just be piano pedagogy but would include all *disciplines*, and then you could structure the coursework in such a way that there’s no reason a violin player can’t take a year of string pedagogy and be teaching and do the same *kind* of things that piano pedagogues have been doing for years. In piano we’ve already worked this out very *carefully*, but we haven’t worked it out in other *disciplines*. Now we can learn from music ed., but the music ed. *thrust* is to train public school teachers, and that’s different. And so what I’m suggesting is that music pedagogy would train not *only* pianists to be good piano teachers, *but* violinists and singers and trombone players.

R: So you are seeing a *bigger, broader* picture for the pedagogy program, right?

S: *Right*. Has anybody suggested that to you before?

R: *No*, actually you’re the first one. So, you think that you should offer music pedagogy programs through different levels instead of just focusing on a piano pedagogy program. Do you see any kind of *obstacles*?

S: One is a *curricular* issue, getting a new curriculum through all the channels, and the other challenge would be to have other faculty on the same page. But I know here, we’re starting to talk about it. Two of our *voice* faculty, one of our *string* faculty talked to me, so I know there’s interest in the idea. The other thing is we need to get NASM *behind* this. NASM has very *broad* pedagogical guidelines at the graduate level; they encourage as *much* pedagogy as possible at the graduate level in all areas. So what I’m suggesting *supports* NASM guidelines. One of the obstacles is *simply* the *time* to do it, getting the curriculum in place, but I see that as the next big step. This *assumes* 50 years from now or 100 years from now people will *still* be playing the piano. And when you *broaden* the curriculum and say music pedagogy, that can go with the *flow* with how things develop, and in that sense, we are going to have *more* technology in the future, and we need to have *more* flexibility in what we *define* as keyboard related topics, and these types of issues will probably continue to be *discussed long* after I’m gone (laugh).

R: So you think faculty is a *possible* issue?

S: Yes, the faculty would be an *important* part of that.

R: So any solution for this?

S: In terms of any solutions, and this is *really* important, I think that whatever happens in the discipline, whether you call it *piano* pedagogy or *music* pedagogy, there *has to* be support from the administration, and there *has to* be support from NASM. Any of the problems right now in the country, *nationally*, in the field of pedagogy, can almost *always* be traced to budget cuts and cuts of faculty and of staff, and we *have to* overcome that, and that means *educating* administrators. I worry about any new administrator who comes in, who *isn’t* really clued in to piano, to the issue of what our piano graduates are going to be doing in 10 years, in five years

even? Current DMA students *struggle* to get positions. How are we going to train these students? The future of piano playing, and organ for that matter is *tied* to piano education and piano training. Many schools are seeing *fewer* undergraduate students desiring to major in piano and organ. Teacher preparation is essential as well. Our doctoral pianists who do not select pedagogy piano often come to me upon graduation and say, “I need help, and I’m not *prepared* enough.” And it’s because all they’ve focused on is their *playing*. It’s all they’ve thought about. It’s very important that *faculty* and *administrators* think of the big picture here. I’m sure that other people have said this, too.

R: Do you have any ideas how to improve *educating* administrators?

S: That’s a *lifelong* adventure. I think one of the things, if your program *places* people in *positions*, if your program graduates people and they get teaching positions, I think that *raises* a strong awareness of how important it is. Nationally, one area that needs some work is the availability of piano pedagogy at all schools, especially *smaller* music departments or schools where keyboard enrollments might be low and specialized courses can be offered infrequently.

R: My last question comes from some research that had suggested that piano should separate from pedagogy, just have a separate degree, and some research has suggested that they should *combine* into one degree. In your idealized program, what type of degree would you like to offer for the different levels?

S: This one is very *hard* to answer. It’s *complicated* and it’s going to depend on the *culture* of the school. I personally *favor* having *separate* degrees at the masters level, but I have to explain this. Our masters degree in piano pedagogy, it is a *separate* degree from piano performance. But you might say, well why not combine it, but here’s the *advantage* for us. I have had students do a performance masters at other universities, but they could still come here and do a second masters in *pedagogy*. But if we *combined* the degree and called it a masters degree in piano performance and piano pedagogy, then students *would not* be able to do that. So I think there’s an advantage at the *masters* level, having two different degrees, one in pedagogy one in performance. The other thing that happens is students come here for piano pedagogy and they *stay* for the second masters in piano performance, or they come here for *performance* and stay for a *second* masters in piano pedagogy. Another hidden advantage is that by pursuing two masters degrees the student does not have to *move up* to the *doctoral* level, they can stay another year and continue to study and develop as a pianist and teacher. On our campus, if a student does two masters, it is a challenge, 64 hours and two recitals, so it’s a *lot* of work. But we’ve had *real* success having two masters degrees, and I wouldn’t want to change it for that reason. Now at the undergrad level, I would *argue* to *combine* piano pedagogy and piano performance if possible. Most students *only* do one undergraduate degree, so at the undergrad level, I would argue to *combine* it and include lots of pedagogy for teacher preparation, and call it performance and pedagogy. At the *doctoral* level, I would argue for a *separate* track combining performance and pedagogy. What is particularly disadvantageous for doctoral students is when a major program has no pedagogy offerings at the doctoral level. Graduates are often excellent players but poorly prepared to teach piano pedagogy, teach in a lab setting, or guide others in their teaching. So the idealized version would be at the masters level, I would say two, at the undergrad, combined, at the Ph.D. or DMA level, as long as there is *some in-depth* pedagogy, *somewhere*. Ultimately at the doctoral level, most students figure out that they have to be able to *teach* in addition to playing well. And if they’ve never walked into a piano lab, or they’ve never taught children, they *quickly* realize that they’ve got to somehow get the experience. Over the years, I have had DMA graduates, from

graduate programs that shall remain nameless, do post-doctoral study with me because the student received no piano teaching preparation.

R: One more question, I'd like to go back to the *laboratory* program. Is it the same as the preparatory program?

S: Yes, it's the *same* as the preparatory program. We *don't* call it a piano preparatory program, we call it a Piano Laboratory Program, and that's a little bit of a *different* term, we called it laboratory because it is *experimental* teaching. People learning how to teach, and they're learning about the art of teaching. So, we felt the term laboratory implies that you are *preparing* the student for future teaching. Thus *laboratory* was a term *pedagogically* more appropriate. The program is pre-collegiate primarily, although *adults* can study in it. It's really a *community* program, open to everyone, and probably 90% of the students are pre-collegiate.

R: Thank you so much.

S: It is nice to talk to you.

Interview with Subject J

R: (Subject J), thank you for your interview today. I'd like to let you know that your school's piano pedagogy program has been *selected* as one of the top 20 university piano pedagogy programs by a group of pedagogues. Now I'd like to ask you, could you think about what kind of *characteristics* would make people vote for your school as one of the top 20?

S: Yes, I have thought about *three* reasons why I think (school's) pedagogy program comes up on a *national* profile, and I think the first is that it has a *historical* tradition, so people associated piano pedagogy and (school). My predecessor, Frances Larimer, ran a very *strong* program in piano pedagogy, and I think people *know* this, and so when they think of (school), piano pedagogy is one of the things they regard historically as an area of strength. (.) So I think that's one of the reasons. I think another reason, and it's probably also tied somewhat into the *past*, is that we have an incredible variety of *student teaching* experiences for our piano pedagogy students, so that, whether it's because of the university or the community we *live* in, they are able to student teach and be *supervised* in working, kindermusic with very young children, typical age beginners, group piano for children, studio classes for high school students, advanced students, class piano. They *gain* experience. We have *all* of these experiences available for our piano pedagogy students, and I think people know that and that is an area of strength. (N.n) And I think maybe the third area is that the school of music at (school) is recognized as having a *strong performance* component, and we are able to, we *relate* very well together at (school), the performance *and* the pedagogy end. And so I think the fact that pedagogy is *respected*, as is the performance tradition at (school), probably gives us a certain amount of credibility.

R: So, you mentioned the variety, I'd like to ask you about the curriculum that you offer. Could you talk about that more, please?

S: (.) We have *two*, one-year sequences of piano pedagogy courses.

R: [You mean the bachelors degree?

S: *No*, they're actually available for a *lot* of different students, but the *one* that would be like for undergraduate students and for masters students is a pedagogy year-long experience that focuses on teaching the *pre-college* student. (.) So that would be anyone from *very* young beginners all the way through high school students, and within that curriculum, we cover the study of piano *methods*, literature that helps *bridge* the students from a method into more traditional repertoire, we cover everything from preparing your students for exams and contests, to teaching kindermusic, running summer music. So it's a whole year devoted to *all* the issues that affect the *younger* student. And then we have a second year of courses that involve the *adult* student. And for us, that includes both adults, or all of adults who begin piano as a *hobby*, you know the late beginners and leisure students. It includes *class* piano for music majors, it includes *advanced* students. We have university students who play like piano majors who take lessons. So it's a wide range of technical studies for adults, but it all focuses on the adult students. And then in addition to that, we sometimes have specialty courses that focus, it depends on the topic that there is at a given time. We're going to have one in the fall on the pedagogy of *chamber music*. And we also have *technology* courses. They're not run by the piano pedagogy faculty, but we have those other *supplemental* kind of courses.

R: So those two years are open for undergraduates and graduate students, also?

S: Undergraduates would be qualified for that *first* year of pedagogy, and graduate students can take *both* of those years, depending on their *backgrounds* when they get here.

R: So do you offer degrees in pedagogy from bachelors degree all the way to the doctoral?

S: [No, no bachelors degree in *pedagogy*, and we only have a performance degree, but our students *must* take a year of pedagogy, but no *degree* in pedagogy at the undergraduate level. Performance and pedagogy degrees are at the masters and doctoral level.

R: OK, so your students gain a lot of teaching experience through different settings. Could you please talk about the *focus* of your teacher training?

S: (.) *All* students in pedagogy teach *all* the time.

R: Who are the students they teach?

S: They teach a *wide* variety. They teach children in the *community*. We have a music academy, which is a prep department, so they teach children in the *prep* department. They may student teach in *kindermusic* classes, primarily with three year olds and four year olds who would be from our community. (.) They teach *university* students who are not music majors, but university students who take piano as a *hobby*, so they would teach, like, *leisure* pianists. They teach university students who are very advanced pianists. We have a lot of students on our campus who might be a *pre-med* major, but they took piano for 12 years, so they give lessons to those students. They do *studio classes* with those students, and they run *juries*, informal juries with those students. They may teach in our keyboard skills classes. That's our class piano for other music majors, so they may student teach, the graduate students may, not undergraduate students, within those settings. (N.n) It would be a lot of *university* students and then also students who are registered through our *music academy*, children.

R: So your undergraduate students can also teach those students?

S: *Yes*.

R: Either undergraduate students or graduate students, they are all qualified to teach those classes?

S: [Yes, some of it depends on their *background*, but all pedagogy students teach *concurrently* all the time, so they take lectures and they start teaching right away.

R: I see, and they teach in both a one-on-one setting and group piano?

S: [And group.

R: And do you have a special course like *practicum* as special training for teaching, or is it included in your core course?

S: [We have two things. It's *included* in all piano pedagogy courses. They all *come with* student teaching, but students who want to do *more* teaching, and we do have students who take a year of piano pedagogy, and then would like to continue teaching similar students. They register for a *practicum*. We call it *internships* in teaching. Yes, they may register after they've had piano pedagogy coursework. They may continue to teach more, and we do have students, that could be *anything* from children and partner lessons, to group classes. It's up to what the individual student and I *design* for that.

R: I see, thank you. Now I'd like to go back. You mentioned *technology*, how is technology being used in your program?

S: I always answer this question very honestly. (.) Students always learn to teach, for example in a digital piano *laboratory*, and they learn some of the basic software that's appropriate for piano teachers, but *all* the graduate students who major in pedagogy must take *technology* classes, but those are actually offered by our *music education* and music technology faculty. They're *not* taught by piano pedagogy faculty.

R: [I see.

S: So, in a sense that's less of a *burden* on me, but it does come with a slightly different *focus*. Those courses are required, but I don't teach them.

R: Do you know what kind of *topics* they cover there?

S: Everything from *web* design, to *software review*, to using *Finale*. It's a wide range of topics.

R: That's excellent. Not every pianist knows how to use those technologies.

S: Right, they know better than I do, because I'm not such an expert.

R: OK, since you mentioned taking a *variety* of courses, I'd like your personal opinion on the qualifications for being a pedagogy instructor. In another way, (.) what type of degree do you think is *best* for being a piano pedagogy professor at a university?

S: Yes, I understand exactly what you're asking me, and I think the *content* of the studies are always more important than the *title* of the *degree*. (.) You know, because degree titles can mean different things, but from my own experience, for example, our doctoral students in piano performance and pedagogy, we assume will go out to *colleges* and universities and teach pedagogy, so I do think it is important that they are in a degree program which includes a *heavy* pedagogy component, (.) and that allows them to continue to play the piano and develop as pianists.

R: So you think that the *content* of the personal training...

S: [What's *in* a degree program, you *can't* absolutely determine that by the *title* of the degree. Although, you know, students who have had a *straight* doctorate in performance and have never taken a pedagogy class would not *typically* be qualified to run a pedagogy class.

R: Thank you. I'd like to shift to finances. *How* is the financial budget distributed in your program?

S: (.) Well, I do have a *small*, independent budget that I can use as I see fit, to buy equipment or whatever. (.) And I am::: this may be unique, I'm not sure, *all* of the students that my students teach pay *small* fees for their instruction (.) and those *fees* go into a pedagogy account, which I may then use to *buy* equipment, or teaching materials, or whatever I think is appropriate for my pedagogy students. (.) And it actually, if I have a lot of pedagogy students teaching a lot of things, that helps me *fund* my own budget, does that make sense?

R: [Yes, definitely. Thank you. Oh, I forgot to ask you about the *textbooks* you use in your course, do you have any *favorites* that you use?

S: I would say that my students *read* chapters and *sections* of a large number of textbooks and journals and so on. One of my favorites, though, is *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* by Marianne Uszler, that is *one* that I do have the students do a lot of work from. They do use *articles* from *Keyboard Companion*, from *Clavier*, from *The American Music Teacher*. (.) My own, my pedagogy students have very *strong* performance backgrounds, so I also have them read articles and chapters from books about everything from performance anxiety, because it's *relevant* to my students, does that make sense? Because I always think pedagogy has to be taught to the *population* of students you teach, and you need to know their backgrounds. (.) So we read from a *huge* list, but I don't adopt, like, only two textbooks, I usually have them read from a large number of sources.

R: That's nice. They read a *broad* amount of information.

S: Well, yes, because I *don't know* what they're all going to do, and some of them will teach children, and some will teach adults, and some won't teach for a while, and some will do a lot of class work, and so I'd like to acquaint them with the *broadest* base of research materials that's out there.

R: Thank you. OK, (.) so we've talked about the curriculum, the technology, the finances, all of those issues. Which of those do you see as the *largest* challenge you're facing in your program?

S: (.) You know, I don't know if it falls under one of your categories, but I will tell you, and then you can use what you want, (.) but our pedagogy courses are *open* to all our piano students, so we also have a *large* number of performance majors who *elect* to take a lot of piano pedagogy, and I would say the only *negative* of that, is that if you count up the exact number of students who are piano pedagogy *majors*, the number may be *fewer* than 10 years ago, but there are actually more students taking piano pedagogy. (.) So sometimes that can be considered a *drawback*, because then an administrator will say, "Well how come you don't have this many majors anymore?" *Because* pedagogy is very open here, and I encourage a lot of performance majors to take it because I *value* their input and because I think that some day they may be teaching anyway, even if they can't see that right now. So the *downside* would be, it doesn't look like I continue to *grow* in the number of specific majors that I have, even though there are *a lot* of students taking pedagogy.

R: (N.n) So, do you know why the number of pedagogy majors, has kind of shrunk, reduced?

S: A little, (.) I think because, I think there are a couple reasons. The *main* reason being that the performance standard for admission at (school) is very *high*, and it is the *same* to be a pedagogy major as it is to be a performance major. (.) And that means that we probably don't *admit* some students who might be qualified. I think every school has to decide this for itself. So that very *high* level of performance audition, probably, we *probably* lose some students. And the other fact is that we *allow* all performance majors access to all the student teaching experiences. They don't have to *declare* pedagogy as a major in order to be able to do this, and so we *draw* a lot of kids who love to think of themselves as *performance majors*. So they stay in that degree program and just take a lot of pedagogy. And you know, maybe that *isn't* a good idea, but it works at *my* school, that's all I can say. It might not work at another school, but I think it works best here, because then our pedagogy, pedagogy is not sort of in a *separate* category by itself, it is just a *part* of what the students do.

R: OK, so all of these challenges you just mentioned, if you could *improve* one immediately, which one would you choose?

S: (N.n) You know what I would do, and it's not exactly the categories we talked about, I would *wish* that we could *add* another piano pedagogy faculty member, or have my performance faculty spend *more* time utilizing some of them. (.) They are *supportive* of pedagogy, but they *don't* have time, and I think that would be an *asset*, if that were possible.

R: So are you the only one in charge of pedagogy?

S: I'm the only one officially in piano pedagogy.

R: I can tell how *busy* you are.

S: [You know, (.) we are an *odd* situation, because, for example, all the people teaching class piano are *professional* teachers, it isn't our masters students teaching. So I have *access* to those teachers who will work with pedagogy students. So that's something that other schools *don't* have, but of the piano faculty members, I'm the only one who's *officially* piano pedagogy, so it would be nice if there were *another* person.

R: So do you think it's going to happen, to have another person hired?

S: I think probably not in the next year or two, but I think it is *possible* for the future.

R: Thank you. So now I'd like to go to my second research question, which is your *vision* of an idealized piano pedagogy program. If you were going to build up an idealized piano pedagogy program, what kind of picture would you *dream* about?

S: You know, I think that I was lucky enough when I took over the program, to *inherit* a program that was very well *organized* and very well run, so I think that in some ways I am *closer* to what I would want for an ideal. *But* (.) what I would chose, if I could yet enhance, would be what we talked about as what I think is my drawback. *Another faculty member*, because I think it's good for the students to have the *perspective* of more, you know, they figure out what I'm about after a while and it's good for them to share ideas with someone else. *Or*, (.) instead of that, if my piano faculty, who are very busy themselves, had *time* to teach some *specialty* topics within piano pedagogy, I think that would enhance my program, I think that would make it more *ideal*.

R: That's nice. So you don't think that's going to happen in a few years. What's the reason?

S: (.) Well, I think that maybe because the number of pedagogy majors *doesn't* continue to *grow*, it remains about the same. And you know, (.) administrators look at it from one point of view. And/or because my piano faculty is *extremely* busy with busy teaching loads, and you know, I don't know, (.) I am hopeful that might happen at some point in the future, but I think that the administration probably thinks we're doing *OK* with piano pedagogy right now, so we probably *don't* have to add anything.

R: So in your idealized program, do you see any possible *obstacles* you will face if you will make this come true?

S: It's probably *budgetary* more than anything. The idea that it would not be *possible* to add another faculty member at this point as long as things are sort of running OK, I think it's probably budgetary. It's not *philosophical*, I'm lucky because the piano faculty is very supportive.

R: Very nice. And you say budget, is there any possible *solution* for this?

S: (N.n) I don't know, (.) it could be that increasing the number of *majors* slightly would show a need for this in a different way, (.) otherwise it's probably a *job* of education, and maybe the piano faculty being willing to lobby to the dean, for example, (.) saying how important this is. He would probably take that.

R: My last interview question is, I've heard you talk about your degree, and, (.) you know there's some research that shows that piano pedagogy should *combine* with performance as one degree, and some suggests that we should *separate* them. In your *idealized* program, what kind of degree would you offer from the undergraduate all the way through the graduate level?

S: Our degrees are all *combined* with performance, and we have philosophically talked about this many times, and always *decided* that that was the *best* educational option for our students.

R: Why do you think so?

S: (.) Because the students who come to (school), and I never think I have the answer for people at other campuses because student *bodies* are different and they have different backgrounds. But our students come here with very *strong* performance credentials and very strong performance backgrounds, and if you *separate* pedagogy, then those students end up feeling very *different* from the rest of the pianists, and it's not *good* for pedagogy on *my* campus. It's best when it's combined with performance and all of the students in the practice rooms feel on an *equal* standing. (N.n) Because that's the kind of kids that come to school at (school), very committed to performance.

R: So you would offer a *combined* degree from the bachelors to the doctoral, *all* the way?

S: [Yes, *all* the way. Yes.

R: Thank you so much.

S: And you know, it is funny, because campuses, when people ask me how I feel, (.) I feel because I deal with the students who are here and I know where they're coming from, and where they think they're *going*, and you always have to *tailor* your pedagogy to the backgrounds and *goals* of the students you teach, I think.

R: Yes, definitely, because every school has *different* situations.

S: [They *do*, and that doesn't mean that at some other schools, a great piano pedagogy major might not be right for their students, it *might*. It just *isn't* ideal here.

R: Thank you so much.

Interview with Subject K

R: Thank you, (Subject K). I'd like to let you know that your school's piano pedagogy program was selected as one of the *top 20* piano pedagogy programs by a group of pedagogues. Could you think about what kind of *characteristics* made people vote for your school as among the top?

S: So, what kind of *characteristics*?

R: Yes, why did people vote?

S: Well, (.) I think (my school) has kind of a *history* in the pedagogy area, (person) used to be *here* in the 1980s, and he was an *important* figure in the pedagogy world. I'm actually fairly *new* here, this is my second year, so, (.) although I'm pretty new I know a lot of people in the pedagogy and I think many people know about me and I've done *presentations* in *conferences*, things like that. So my guess is that, I don't know, the people either *remember* (person) and remember the tradition of excellence from the 80s may have voted for (my school) because of that, and then people who *know* me and have heard me do presentations and things like that may also have voted because of that reason. (.) In general, the school has a very *strong* piano program, as well, (.) so we have, you know, degrees up to the doctoral level in performance. We *don't* have a doctorate in pedagogy at the moment.

R: But you have a masters in piano pedagogy?

S: We *do* have a master in piano pedagogy and people doing a performance doctorate can also do an *emphasis* in pedagogy. (.) We offer a number of graduate level courses in pedagogy, and also we have the option of having the *DMA* people, even people in performance have the option of doing a *thesis* track, so they can actually do a *document* on a pedagogy topic.

R: So how about the bachelors degree, do you have a pedagogy *major*?

S: [No, the bachelors, we don't offer a bachelors in pedagogy, and we don't *intend* to. (N.n) All our piano majors, performance majors are *required* to take pedagogy, piano pedagogy, but the reason why we *don't* want to create a pedagogy degree at the bachelors, I mean, (.) we want to provide as *much* teaching experience as *possible* through the *performance* program. (.) We believe that a good teacher has to be a good *performer*, so we have the *philosophy* that a performance degree at the bachelors is actually a good thing for someone who is interested in *pedagogy*. (.) And like I said, all of the performance bachelors take the *whole* sequence of pedagogy courses and they do *practicum* teaching, and all of the things that other schools actually offer *only* for the *BM* in pedagogy. (.) We offer it for *everyone*.

R: I see, so it's offered for everyone.

S: It's not only open, it's *required*.

R: So you think *history* is the main reason that made people vote for your program?

S: Perhaps, (.) history might be one of the reasons, and the other reason, you know, we are a *large* school. We've produced many, well, I shouldn't say large, we're medium-sized, but it's a very *active* school, in all areas, and we have a *strong* program in piano. (.) And as I said, I should say I'm, maybe I shouldn't say this *myself*, but I'm pretty young, and I've been in the field for about seven or eight years. My *first* teaching job was in Ohio, Ohio University and I started there in '98, but I've always tried to be very, *very active* in the field, and as I said I've done many presentations, and I'm *very* involved with *MTNA*, so also people know me from there.

R: Thank you. I'd like to go back to the courses you mentioned in more depth. Could you please talk about the curricular *content* in your program, all from the bachelors to the doctoral?

S: Sure, we offer two *required* courses for the undergraduates, one is *Elementary Piano Pedagogy*, where they learn about *methods*, techniques for teaching children, beginner children and beginner adults as well, and that includes observation, regular observation of *local teachers* as well as *group classes* for children that we'll start offering, actually this fall. And it also includes *practicum* teaching segments that they have to *videotape* and meet with me to discuss on a regular basis. (N.n) The second course for the undergraduates is *Intermediate Piano Teaching*, or *Intermediate Piano Pedagogy*, where we explore the *repertoire* at the intermediate level and advanced level, plus a number of other topics like *performance anxiety*, *health issues* related to *performance*, we also explore things like memorization, functional scales like harmonization, improvisation. All of those are covered in the second semester, which is the intermediate. (.) Plus, they have, again, *observation* and (.) teaching segments that are videotaped. So that's the undergraduate. There is a *third* course for the undergraduates, which is optional, which is a *practicum* teaching course that allows students to do *more* supervised teaching, to go *beyond* what the regular course requires.

R: Is this mainly for a one-on-one setting, or for group teaching, too?

S: So far, it has been a *one-on-one* setting, (.) but as I said, we are going to start offering group lessons for beginner *children* next fall. And so that will also allow them to *observe* group teaching and to *try* group teaching with beginners. (N.n) Now, for the graduate level course, we have different courses as well. The first course is a *group piano pedagogy* course. That's for the masters and for the doctoral. (.) And that involves, you know, group teaching techniques, it involves *exploring* materials, textbooks, observation of adult group class, (.) of both music majors and *non-music* major classes, and also *practicum* teaching where the students have to teach *segments* in groups for the group classes. (.) So that's the first semester, the second semester of the graduate level is also *intermediate piano pedagogy* and *advanced piano pedagogy*. (.) And we go beyond the undergraduate level, I mean we do some of the same things, exploring repertoire, observing advanced teaching, and also videotaped teaching segments. (.) But they also *do* more papers and they also have to read a number of books that relate to a number of different topics in the performance and pedagogy and music *education* area, and submit *reports* on those books at some point. (.) All of the undergraduate and the graduate courses include segments on *technology*. That's one of the *strengths* of our program, so I do an introduction to *MIDI technology*, to *recording* technology, to *videotape* technology. They learn how to *burn* CDs and DVDs. They also learn how to create a *website*. So there is a strong technological component. We spend about two or three weeks on technology projects. We're also looking at *current* programs, like *computer* programs that people can use in their piano teaching. (N.n) So going back to the graduate level, I mentioned two courses so far, the *group piano* and the *intermediate*. There is a *third* course, which is a *practicum teaching* course which is *required* for pedagogy majors, so there is more *intense* supervised teaching activities there. (.) And then there is a fourth course, which is a *seminar* course, which I haven't yet offered. This is my second year here, so I will offer it, actually, next year, and we explore a number of different topics that go from current *research*, looking at current research and books, into a more in-depth introduction to *technology*, and you know, a different series of different topics, *creating* materials for presentations, writing articles for *publication*. (N.n) So that will be offered in the spring next year. And that's our graduate level courses *required* for pedagogy majors. It's optional for *performance* majors.

R: It says that you have a practicum course offered at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, right?

S: (.) Yeah, we do, and those, I mean, those are *optional* for the undergraduates. The actual pedagogy course, you know the elementary and intermediate pedagogy courses do include a *supervised* teaching segment, (.) but for students who are interested in doing *more* supervised teaching, we offer those *other* courses.

R: Can you please talk about how your students get teaching experience?

S: Yeah, sure. (N.n) Both the undergraduate and graduate courses, as I said, *include* supervised teaching. We offer, I mean, they basically get a chance to teach students through *continuing education*, adult students mainly through continuing education. We also worked out, (.) we don't have a *preparatory* level here at the moment, so we signed an agreement with a *community music* school here, so that our undergrad students can teach *children* through that community music school for their supervised teaching assignments. (N.n) As I said, we are going to start offering it this *coming* year. We're going to start offering group classes for *children*, for community children, so that will also give them a chance to try their group teaching *skills* with children. So basically it's going to work as follows: The undergraduates will observe *every* single class; the class meets once per week; so they will observe all the classes with the *children*; they will be sitting there *next* to the children, helping the children in case they need help with anything, and then they will get a chance to *work* with the children individually on a one-on-one basis, working on some of the same material that we'll start in the class. (.) And then they'll also get a chance to *teach* some of the group segments, so they also have a chance to *direct* a *whole* group.

R: So is that part of an *internship* in your program?

S: [Exactly, that's part of the *practicum* internship.

R: So you mentioned technology, it seems that you know technology very well and it's very strong in your program. Could you please talk about technology, more? How is technology used in your program, please?

S: Sure, well first of all, (.) we have a piano lab, which has individual *computers*, each of the keyboards has a computer. It's an ideal setting for teaching technology because students can do things *individually* on their own keyboards, you know, creating *accompaniments* and things like that. So, each of the computers, basically, they are *connected* to the keyboards as I said, but they are also connected to the *internet*. All of them. We do a number of things, our class piano program makes use of those computers in different *ways*, recording tests, for instance. Playing accompaniments, MIDI accompaniments. (.) And in pedagogy, basically what we *do* is we cover some of the main program titles that people use in teaching, things like MIDIaurus, for instance, or MusicAce, which is another program. *Home Concert*, which is an accompaniment program. So we take a look at *all* of those. They also learn how to create *MIDI files*. For instance, one of the assignments is for them to take an intermediate level piece, something like Kabalevsky, or anything, Schumann or anything, and to *create* an *orchestrated* accompaniment to the piece. So they learn how to use a *sequencer*, a MIDI sequencer to create MIDI files. So that's one part. And then another area is using technology for *administrative* purposes. For instance, like learning how to create a *website*, so that they create a studio website or a personal website that includes, you know, just *biography* and *studio policy* and all of that. They also learn how to edit *sound*, for instance, one of the assignments for the intermediate level course is, they need to learn a number of intermediate pieces and *play* them in *class*. I record those pieces and they later have to edit those pieces, get rid of unwanted noise, for instance, or *splice* it. And then they learn to burn a CD and they learn to export it as a *MP3 file*, so the MP3 file is then posted on their personal website. (.) They also, this year we didn't have time for that, but *ideally* when I teach

my seminar, part of it will be how to edit a *movie*, videotape, yourself and to edit, add *titles* for instance, transitions, and then to burn a *DVD*. So that's another area that we cover in the technology. (.) Most importantly, also, is you know, becoming *familiar* with what technology is available so that eventually, when they set up their own studio, they know what kind of *electronic* piano they should buy; they know how to *connect* an electronic piano to a computer; they know how to play commercial accompaniments, you know, those that come with, you know that comes as a MIDI file, how to *work* with a *MIDI* file. And also, how to *create* accompaniments for their students, how to use technology for improvisation, as well. They get to learn how to use programs like *Band in a Box*, for instance, which is a program that provides accompaniments, how to create *backgrounds* for improvisation and for *harmonization*. So that's kind of a *general* overview of the things that people use in technology.

R: For this technology part, do you have any *favorite* software you use, particularly?

S: I mean I don't have specific titles, (.) but personally I use a number of different programs, I use *Finale* for instance, to create scores. I use *Finale Performance Assessment*, which is another program, which is great for *sight reading*, and we use that in class piano. I use *Home concert*, which is a program that is very flexible for providing accompaniments, *Band in a Box* to create MIDI files for improvisation. We use programs that I've written *myself*, as well. (.) We have a couple of programs in the piano lab that allow students, the students in class piano, it allows them to *record* things as MIDI files and *e-mail* them to the teacher, for instance, and another program that allows them to play accompaniments or backgrounds for *improvisations*. It's a very simple program that I wrote. Also a *sight-reading* program that I wrote. So I, you know, I'm an *amateur programmer* as well, so I like technology very much, and I like creating these kind of things. (.) I mean, *sequencers*, we have also, we are currently using *Cubase*, is the name of a sequencer, but I don't really have a favorite one. We sometimes change to other programs. For sound editing we use a free program called *Audacity*, which is a Macintosh MP3 program. (.) For creating websites we use *Mozilla*, which is, again, for both computers, which is another free program. I try to include as many *free* programs as possible so that you know, students can actually *download* onto their computer at home and keep *exploring* those technology tools.

R: Thank you, it seems like you know a lot about technology. Now I'd like you to talk about yourself, your background. Being a pedagogy faculty, I know you got a DMA degree, some get a Ph.D. degree. In your own personal opinion, what type of degree do you think is the best for being a pedagogy faculty member?

S: A pedagogue? Yeah, it all depends on your *main* focus. I know that there are some schools that are very much research oriented, that offer a Ph.D. in pedagogy, I think that's the *case* with Texas. They offer a Ph.D. Where did you study?

R: North Texas.

S: (.) North Texas. And then Oklahoma offers both a Ph.D. and DMA. I mean, if you're going to be heading a program that offers a *Ph.D.* with a very strong research component, I think a good background in *research* is necessary, like in quantitative research, like Texas is very strong in quantitative research. Or qualitative research, Oklahoma is very strong in both, actually.

(N.n) But for many programs, you know, the beauty about pedagogy programs is that they don't necessarily have to be so heavy into *research*, and I know several programs, for instance, a couple of weeks ago I was in a university with the chair. The program offers a DMA in pedagogy, which doesn't have much of a *research* component, so you can still offer a good DMA in pedagogy without having to offer, you know, a *hard* research core like in Texas or places like that. (.) So for someone who's gonna head a program like that, I think sometimes, I

mean, a DMA in pedagogy is *greatly* recommended, but a DMA in performance with a very *strong* pedagogy experience or pedagogy component, I think that might be *enough*. (N.n) Definitely for programs that are masters only in pedagogy, again I think a masters degree in *pedagogy* and a DMA in performance may be, also, *enough*. (.) You know, it's, if you think 40 or 50 years ago when all of these pedagogy programs were *starting*, in Northwestern and Michigan and other places, the people who started those programs did not really *have* a DMA in pedagogy, because they didn't exist. But they did have a very *strong* background in pedagogy, a lot of experience, some of them had a *music education* background, so I think it depends very much, also, on your *background* and your experience. The degree, sometimes, having a DMA in pedagogy, it's *ideal*, but it's *not* required. So anyway, myself, my DMA is in performance. It's not in pedagogy, and I feel qualified to *head* a pedagogy program basically, because I've been so involved in the *field*, and that gives me the experience.

R: So you think *personal* experience is the main factor?

S: [It is. (N.n) I don't want to go into the other end, saying that if you wanna teach pedagogy a pedagogy degree is not required, because that's *wrong*. (.) You do need a very strong pedagogy component as part of your *background*. (.) For instance, in our program right now, we offer a DMA in performance only, but, the students doing performance have the option of *writing*, for instance, a *thesis* in pedagogy. So even though their degree says performance, if someone went through the whole process of *researching* a topic, writing a thesis, doing *practicum* teaching, taking *all* the coursework in pedagogy. (.) You know, I think that person would be *more* than qualified to head a graduate program in pedagogy.

R: Right, thank you. Now I'd like to shift to the financial issue. (.) How is the financial situation distributed in your program?

S: (.) I have to say that, as in most *public* schools, most public universities, the finances are *not* good. After saying that, I have to say that we've been *lucky* in many ways. We are a *college* of music. We are not a school of music, so that means that we have certain *independence*. We don't have to *share* a budget for instance with dance and arts. (.) We have our own university budget, so our dean is able to *allocate* that with much more freedom than if we were a fine arts college, or something like that. But it has been *difficult* in the last five, six years it seems, it's been a difficult time for everyone in the country, especially for music programs. (.) We don't have a specifically pedagogy *budget*, itself. We do have a keyboard budget which is mainly used for visiting artists and things like that. (.) But I have to say that the *library* is very responsive to my requests, whenever I need. I want them to buy things they go ahead and buy pretty much everything I ask so in that regard it's very good, we have a *good* library right now. (.) When I was hired, I was given a certain amount for *startup* funds, so that allowed me to invest in *technology* and in printed material, as well, so I was lucky. Now these funds are running out, actually, at the end of June. So after that, I'm not sure what's going to happen, I may have to just, you know, *every* year we submit *requests* to the dean, so I basically have to start going into the *general pool* and hopefully get *funding* for that. (.) We're lucky in many ways. For instance, the piano lab, we have an agreement with a keyboard seller here in Denver. It's a *loan* agreement, so we get new electronic pianos every single year. So we actually *change* them every single year, so that way we don't spend money on electronic keyboards. (N.n) Yeah, and as I said, I try to bring visiting scholars, for instance, Jane Magrath was here last spring. Gail Berenson was here a couple of weeks ago. (.) And in order to do that, I support that with money from the college and also from money from the university. (.) You know, it'd be nice to have a

fixed budget that I could spend on books and things like that. We don't have that, but so far I've been *lucky* to have pretty much every request.

R: Thank you. So we have talked about curriculum.

S: //I wanted to mention one more thing. I mentioned earlier that we are creating a *children's* class. Also I mentioned that we offer continuing *education* lessons. So all of those are self-supported. (.) For the children, they pay a fee, and that fee goes to pay, the graduate students will actually be in charge of the class, (.) so that will be used for paying that and for buying materials. And then continuing education, we offer evening classes for adults, group piano classes, and that gives us *some* money, again, to pay our graduate students in *addition* to the financial aid they get from the school, they will sometimes get classes and things like that.

R: So those students, they pay their tuition, and the school has part of the tuition as funding?

S: Well in the case of continuing education, the students taking the *class*, there is a continuing education *department*, they pay them, and continuing education pays the instructor. In the case of the children's class, it's gonna be handled *through* the college, so the children, the parents will actually pay the college and that *money* will be used for the pedagogy program, so that will *generate* income for the pedagogy program.

R: Thank you. So we talked about *all* the issues of curriculum, finance, technology, and structure. By the way, how many instructors are teaching pedagogy courses?

S: *Only* me.

R: One person, you must be very busy, in charge of so many.

S: I am very, *very* busy, yes. Actually, I am grading papers right now.

R: Which issue do you think is the *largest* challenge you are facing in your program?

S: (.) Well I guess, one of the challenges is what we just mentioned, the fact that right now it's only *one* person doing all of the pedagogy, and that's me, basically. This is one of the reasons why we only offer a *masters* at the moment in pedagogy. We are talking with the music education faculty about *possibly* starting a doctorate in pedagogy and for the students to take *advantage* of some of the music education courses, some of the *research* courses, psychology of learning and all of that. (.) So that's a possibility for the future. But right now it is pretty *hard* to handle everything, I mean all the coursework, with just *one* person. Other challenges, well let me think. (N.n) I think, well, we, I think we're lucky here that when the person who was here before me, when she retired, or she moved on to another job, actually, that the administration decided to keep pedagogy *alive*. (.) I think one of the challenges, not for our school, but generally for the field, is that pedagogy programs, the administrators are losing *interest* in pedagogy programs recently. If you think for instance, of Northwestern. When Frances Larimer retired a few years ago, that program used to have, I think *two* people in pedagogy. They did *not* hire anyone to replace her, so there is only one person right now in Northwestern doing pedagogy, and that has an impact on the program. (.) I mean, Northwestern used to be a very, very *large* program, and now, you know, it's smaller than it used to be and I think one of the reasons is that they *don't* have the faculty numbers that they had before. And I think that's true for other programs. (.) Other programs, as pedagogy faculty retire, they are either *downsizing*, or just decide not to hire someone with pedagogy background, pedagogy experience to teach those courses. Maybe they give those coursework to someone who is *more* of a performer than in pedagogy. (.) So that's, I think one of the *challenges*. And it's an interesting trend.

R: Do you know why they would lose interest?

S: I don't know. I think it has to do, perhaps, with, and by the way this is not true for every school, but some programs. I think it has to do with the *lack* of resources. (.) The last few years

have been *hard* for many schools, many universities are *downsizing*. But sometimes I kind of *fail* to understand exactly the reason because pedagogy is a field that will provide graduating students with a secure *job*, because someone with a bachelors or with a masters in pedagogy is very qualified to go outside school, *finish* their study, and set up their own very *successful* studio, to do group teaching, for instance, to be really financially *secure* after graduation. Whereas performance majors, sometimes it's much *harder* for them to start a career if they don't have the pedagogy background. (.) So I fail to understand why some programs, some schools are just losing *interest*, *administrators* are just losing interest in pedagogy. Hopefully this will be *reversed*, and I think it's very important for those of us who are in the pedagogy field to keep making a lot of *noise*, keep presenting, keep being *strong* as a group, you know. (N.n) MTNA also needs their role in that, and also the other association, National Conference in Keyboard Pedagogy. Well it's a good thing that it got started *again* three or four years ago, so it's a group that keeps *reminding* administrators that you need someone who's qualified to lead the programs, and that kind of program is actually a very *profitable* program. It makes a lot of *sense* for both undergrad and grad. (N.n) Another challenge, if I may say, another challenge facing the pedagogy field, not our program in particular but the pedagogy field in *general*, I think there is kind of a lack, not so much in the pedagogy field, but in the *teaching* field, a lot of the younger teachers are kind of losing *sight* of the national organizations. When you look at MTNA for instance, that association is *aging*, so *quickly*. I think the average age of MTNA members must be around 55 right now. So that's a challenge, we have to *energize* the younger generations to become *advocates* for pedagogy and for teaching, for *studio* teaching. (.) So that's another challenge, and I think that if MTNA is going to survive, they really *need* to do a better job *recruiting* the younger generation, going *into* schools with pedagogy programs and becoming *part* of their program.

R: So you mentioned several challenges. If you could improve only *one* challenge at a time, which one would you be most anxious to improve *immediately*?

S: Well obviously the *funding* would be, but that's *beyond* my control basically, I mean, it would be ideal. (.) I mean, in our case, for instance, I would love to be able to, we have a *small* pedagogy library which is outside the main library. For instance, to really have a *budget* so that we can buy *new* publications as they come out. We are, I mean, the main library *already* buys some of those things for us, but things like methods for instance, they will *not* buy methods, they tend to buy, usually, *textbooks*. (.) So it would be ideal, that, I think, money would do wonders for that kind of thing.

R: Do you have any ideas how to *improve* the funding?

S: It's the university *level*, (.) so I mean, advocating for money for *higher* education, so voting for senators who will *increase* that or governors who will support higher education in their own states, so obviously that's *pretty* basic. (.) But also I think it's just important for people in the pedagogy field to make *sure* that administrators know that it's an important program, that it has to be *supported*, and it's a job *engine*, basically, you are educating students who will go out of school and will know what to do to *earn* some money, basically.

R: Very practical. Thank you. (.) Now I'd like to ask you my next research question, which is your *dream* of an idealized pedagogy program. So if you were going to build up your own idealized piano pedagogy program, what kind of dream would you *visualize*?

S: Well, (.) I think it's important, (.) a couple of things. First of all, I think it would be important to *combine* the pedagogy program with a *preparatory* level, so ideally, for our program for instance, unfortunately we *don't* have the space, the physical space to *do* that. (N.n) but I think

it's very *important*, pedagogy is such a *practical* field, that you need to provide *very* good observation opportunities for the students, and *very* good practicum teaching opportunities. And *not* just at the adult college level, but also observing classes with *children* and things like that. So *having* a preparatory division would be an *ideal* way to do that. (.) And of course you need more than *one* person to run it. If we were to start something like that, they would *really* need to hire someone to be in charge of that preparatory division. (.) So that's one thing that I think any ideal program *should* have. You know, many programs, well I shouldn't say many, but *some* programs at the university level, the *only* practicum that they do is teaching *college* students, adult piano beginners. And they don't have enough experience with things like, for instance, *pre-kindergartners*, (.) it is so *different* to teach music to that level, and you really need to *observe* people doing it, you can't just learn it by just reading a book or watching a videotape, you have to be there in the room with the children and with the teacher to really start *understanding* how to work in that way. (.) So ideally, a good program would have those *components* in place, a preparatory division that includes also a pre-kindergarten level. (N.n) I think that obviously a very *strong* library is an important part of an ideal program. A library that includes all sorts of *methods* and sheet music, very important. (.) I think an ideal program would also give the *option* to students doing DMA to focus on, if they're interested, to focus more on *research*. A program should have those *options* in place, quantitative, qualitative research, maybe working together with the music *education* area. What else? (.) Obviously *physical* things, space, which is a struggle for us, we have outgrown our building, basically. It is an *old* building. (.) You know things like, something that I had in Ohio that I *don't* have here, two piano labs. At that time, I didn't realize when I was in Ohio how *great* that was. We have just one piano lab, so we have a struggle for *time* in there sometimes. We could be offering a lot more non-major classes if we wanted, but we *can't* because we don't have *time* in there. You know, having a *larger* piano lab, that would also be ideal, right now we have, our room is pretty tight. (.) A piano lab that might include a space where there could be things other than playing the piano, like, for instance, *moving*, and for *movement* and for things like that, or for people bringing other instruments or percussion instruments, we have *no* room for that kind of thing. And an ideal program would have two piano labs with extra *space* in there so that other things could be done *in* the piano lab, it's *not* just sitting next to each other on an electronic keyboard playing that. (.) And of course, I think also, a good pedagogy program needs *relationships* with *local* teachers, so it's important to, and we have a good relationship with our local chapters of MTNA, so an ideal program would, you know work together with local chapters to provide *practical* observation with local teachers.

R: Thank you. (.) So, in your vision, would you see any obstacles if you were going to build up this ideal program?

S: (N.n) Well, I mean, for the ideal program, I think the main obstacle would of course be getting the *funding*, that would be an obstacle. The other would be, you know, to run an ideal program we would probably need a couple *people* teaching in the pedagogy area, so *one* person is not enough and that might be an *obstacle* because I'm not sure if we're planning to expand, I don't see that happening in the near future, so that might be an obstacle. Obviously, the *physical* space is an obstacle that is very hard to solve. (.) But you know, I'm pretty happy here, I mean, it's really a place where there's a *lot* to be done and a lot of things can happen here, and it has a lot of *potential*, so I'm very happy about that.

R: So for the obstacles you just mentioned, is there any possible solution for that? Do you see any?

S: Well funding would do *wonders*, I mean, funding to hire a second person in pedagogy, funding to have a *fixed* budget for the program, you know, for the physical space obviously funding is also an issue, but there are also other things to consider. (.) I have to say, one of the nice things about this program is that my performance colleagues are very *supportive* of what I do in pedagogy. So I don't see that as a problem here, but I think for other programs, perhaps, (.) the pedagogy area is seen as kind of a *lesser* area, something that is not as *worthy* of support as a performance area, and that may be another reason why some programs are *fading*, because some performers don't have a high *regard* for what we do as pedagogy teachers, so, but, (.) fortunately here, that's *not* the case, we have a lot of support, which is very good, actually.

R: That's very nice to hear that. My last question, you know that some research suggests that piano pedagogy and performance degrees should be *separate*. Some research suggests that they should be combined as *one* degree. In your opinion, in your idealized program, what kind of degree would you offer for the different levels, and *why*?

S: //I strongly feel that they should be *combined*. (.) Our masters is a masters in performance and pedagogy, it's *both* things. We only accept people that can play the piano in the program, (.) we make sure that a student who we *accept* can play a degree recital. That is *essential*. We don't want to take people who basically, you know, might have talent as teachers but they cannot *play* the piano, because, perhaps, if you are not very *proficient* at piano you can maybe start with teaching at the very elementary level, but, you know it's *not* ideal either. But as soon as you get into the intermediate level, you need an *artist*, in spite of being a *good* teacher, you need someone who is really *artistic* as a pianist. So I don't believe in programs that separate the two areas, (.) because you end up with someone who knows a lot about research, knows a lot about bibliography, but perhaps cannot sit and *play* a Mozart sonata, and I mean, how can you teach someone to be a good pianist at the highest artistic level if you *cannot* do it yourself. (.) So I believe that you know, both areas of *training*. And I can say the same thing for the performance area. (.) I mean, I think it's ridiculous to have a performance degree where the students don't take, don't have *any* exposure to pedagogy, because it's *unrealistic*. (.) When they graduate, they're going to teach, (.) I mean, most people who graduate with degrees in performance, end up doing some kind of *teaching*, so we do a disservice to the field by not offering those people at least some pedagogy training.

R: So you think a *combined* degree should be offered through the undergraduate to the graduate level.

S: *Yeah*, exactly, (.) I mean, although we don't offer a pedagogy degree, an *undergraduate* pedagogy degree, the performance degree, the people doing the performance degree at the undergrad are *required* to take pedagogy, so it's a part of their *education*.

R: Yes, you think that *both* requirements are very important as a pianist.

S: Right, exactly. A *combination* is essential.

R: Thank you very much. Your information is very important and valid to my study.

Interview with Subject L

R: What do you think are the attributes that your program has that would make individuals recommend it as one of the top 20 piano pedagogy programs in the United States?

S: I would think that there are two reasons which contribute to this result. (.) The first reason is that we have wonderful piano faculty members. Students come here not only to learn pedagogy but also to enhance their performance skills. The second reason is because we have a huge preparatory program that provides pedagogy students the opportunity to teach at all levels from early childhood music to university college class piano. They gain teaching experiences that they probably did not have before coming to our program.

R: So, they get a lot of piano students to teach.

S: Right.

R: They teach in the preparatory department?

R: Exactly, private and also class piano. As part of the preparatory program, we have a very large early child music program from birth to 6 years of age.

R: How many?

S: Almost 800 students.

R: That's a lot.

S: Yes.

R: Can you describe the curricular content of the pedagogy courses at your institution at both the undergraduate and graduate levels?

S: Ok. At the undergraduate level, we have two courses in the first year that all piano majors are required to take-- Beginning Piano Pedagogy and Intermediate Piano Pedagogy. In the beginning level, we deal with business aspects such as setting up a studio, and also survey methods and supplementary materials pertaining to *beginning students*. As part of this course, they *observe* and teach beginning students. We also deal with learning theories, as far as how do students learn in the different *philosophies*, and what types of learning theories exist, but we cover more details at the graduate level. (.) The second semester deals with in depth study of *intermediate repertory* and also the challenges associated with teaching older students and *pre-college* students. In

addition, we also offer an introduction to class piano and to early childhood music. Students observe intermediate students, class piano, early childhood classes and adult beginners, and the 3rd and 4th semesters of the undergraduate level are only for *pedagogy majors* unless performance majors take it as *elective* courses. In the 3rd semester, they continue to do student teaching and *increase* to teach more than one student. (.) We deal with a lot of group teaching from the early childhood level to adult beginners and look through their repertory. (N.n) The 4th semester is practicum which involves teaching several students, preparing students' recitals, dealing with *video taping* their lessons, critiquing their own teaching and presenting their video tapes to pedagogy professors for *evaluation*.

(.) At the graduate level, there are *four* courses. The first is Comprehensive Piano Pedagogy that partly is for *catching up* because we have many international students and their backgrounds in pedagogy may vary greatly. Sometimes we need to go back to *review*, sometimes we don't, depending on the *qualification* of new students. Also, we do a lot more examination of learning theories, the history of piano pedagogy and continuing to observe students in the preparatory division. (.) The 2nd semester is Advanced Group Piano Pedagogy in

which students assist one of our piano *faculty* in teaching a session of class piano. (.) They examine all the supplementary materials, and texts of class piano. The idea is that *hopefully* if they do well and their communication skill is *sufficient*, then, the following year they can teach their own section of class piano. In the 3rd semester, students are really looking at *research*, different kinds of research techniques and examining many theses in the pedagogy field. The fourth semester is primarily for students' *lecture recitals*. It is a presentation and delivery of the lecture recital.

R: So, what you just said that the first semester is for the review, second for group piano teaching, the third is for the research and the fourth is for graduation recital?

S: Yes, we deal with *more* advanced group teaching at the graduate level.

R: This includes a lot of teaching training.

S: That's right:: The graduate students teach as faculty members in the music preparatory division. If they have an *assistantship*, they teach up to 10 hours a week or more with many students at a variety of levels. (.) They can teach more than 10 hours and get paid as well. So they are truly *employed* as faculty members.

R: (.) What you just talked about, that is the internship program you have.

S: Yes. However, (.) we have some students who have already *established* teaching experiences and just want *graduate* degrees, so we can count that experience as well and with the same kind of video taping being done. So faculty can critique their teaching as well. We don't demand them to do 10 hours.

R: How about the teacher training for undergraduates?

S: (.) The undergraduate students get hands-on teaching experiences through the pedagogy classes --supervised very *carefully* by pedagogy faculty. We select the materials that they use and guide them carefully.

R: So, (.) for undergraduate students, they get hands-on teaching experiences in pedagogy class, right?

S: Right. (N.n) Each student is assigned one preparatory student to teach through the semester.

R: Who are the students?

S: They would be the students:: This is an arm of the preparatory that is called "lab program" which means that they pay reduced tuition. Their parents realize that they are getting an *inexperienced* teacher from the university pedagogy program but *supervised* by the faculty.

R: Do they have public lessons in front of the pedagogy class?

S: Yes:: occasionally we do that, but not all the time. But they do a group and then each undergraduate takes each of them off to a private lesson as well and then return together as a group. The undergraduate takes turn teaching the group and also *video taping* for observation by the faculty.

R: Can you describe the qualifications of your piano pedagogy instructors?

A: (N.n) We have two instructors in the pedagogy program right now. (.) I have worked on all but the dissertation toward a Ph.D. in music education with an emphasis in *piano pedagogy*. My masters degree and bachelors are piano pedagogy degrees. The other person has a doctoral degree in piano pedagogy, but I am not sure about her masters and bachelors degree. She is very strong in *pedagogy*, not performance. Well, (.) I would guess (.) pedagogy.

R: In your opinion, what type of degree do you think is best to have for instructors to teach piano pedagogy courses and why?

A: (N. n) It is *difficult* to say (.) because I have known very successful pedagogy instructors with only performance backgrounds without pedagogy degrees. Obviously, I think a pedagogy degree

would be *essential* just to have had the experience of taking the courses, otherwise, it seems that you would start completely over without past experiences. (.) Fortunately, there are many good pedagogy conferences offering and sharing many good ideas for pedagogy instructors. I think it is essential that you have to have experience teaching *pre-college* students. (.) And a lot of time, performance majors have only had university teaching experiences in class piano. I think there is too much pedagogy involved in teaching children. (.) I have also known successful pedagogy instructors with music education backgrounds. Because music education courses provide *learning theory* and *psychology*, it is very beneficial to approach from that angle as well. So, (.) I think that music education background is another possibility as long as the playing ability is sufficient.

R: You feel that having the pedagogy training is the most important.

S: That's right.

R: Ok, now let's talk about finances. In terms of finances, how is the budget distributed in your program?

A: (.) well::: it is interesting because the preparatory division has its own budget. It is very closely *allied* with pedagogy. In the past, I had been the *only* one pedagogy person since I also directed the preparatory program. The preparatory funds have been used to help the pedagogy division purchase equipment and materials, because it goes so hand in hand for use by both the pedagogy and preparatory divisions. I assume that this situation will continue. (.) In the same way the pedagogy students who teach as part of their assistantship for us, we are paying them as faculty and the money is generated *for* their teaching. Essentially that is the assistantship.

S: (N.n) Then money is left over from that because we don't pay them 100% of what we charge. The money can be used to buy library books, and equipment or things that are necessary.

R: You mean that the graduate students make money for the department to buy things that are needed, right?

S: [That's *right*.

R: How is technology used in your program?

S: *We* have *strong* technology. (.) Again I am speaking how the preparatory program is and the equipment is also available for the pedagogy students. They can see and use the equipment when they do their observation. Every studio has digital equipment, sound modules with sequencers used for teaching, keyboard labs for teaching groups of children, and computer labs for theory instruction. The (State) Music Teacher Association has a very strong theory testing program. We use the *computer system* to help students to prepare for that.

R: Do faculty teach students how to utilize the equipment?

S: Yes. (.) I failed to mention that earlier. *Technology* is an important component in pedagogy classes.

R: (N.n) From the issues that we have discussed above, which one do you see as the largest challenge of your program?

R: (N.n) you know, this is maybe unique to our program, but I feel (.) the biggest challenge is because we have such an esteemed, *high-powered* piano faculty that attracts really talented performance majors from all over the world and their admissions is based on their audition. The *stronger* performers major in piano performance, and the *less* strong performers tend to major in piano pedagogy. So we have to fight for them. (.) I hope as our program continues to grow, performance faculty will be added (.) that may even have a pedagogy background-- a strong performance teacher who can serve the performance faculty for pedagogy students.

R: So, you consider that the biggest challenge in your program is to fight the qualifications of incoming students with the performance division.

S: Yes, that is true::

R: However, if you could only improve one challenge at a time for your program, which issue would you be most anxious to improve immediately and why?

S: We::: I think probably being able (.) to provide *adequate* supervision and observation for student teachers, because typically that is very time consuming and not necessarily counts as a part of course loads. (.) It would be *wonderful* if we had a team such as the instructors in the preparatory division who could each take one or two pedagogy students and supervise them *throughout* the semester. We do observe, but only 3-4 lessons per student in one semester if we have big classes with 10 students. That is so much for *one* pedagogy person to do. So, you end up (.) not being able to observe as much as we would like and having to answer lots of questions and problems that arise and you haven't necessarily *viewed* the problem by observing the lessons. (.) It is so much for just one instructor to do. It is very difficult to handle all the questions that arise through students' teachings. (.) It is time consuming to provide really adequate supervision.

R: You mean that you would like to have enough faculty members to supervise student teaching.

S: Exactly.

R: Ok, you talked about the status in your program. Now, please talk about your dream. In your mind, if you were going to plan an idealized piano pedagogy program in the future, how would you envision this piano pedagogy program?

S: (N.n) Well, I think that an ideal pedagogy program would have *many* piano pedagogy majors so that the class would be big and resources were coming in through tuition to have many faculty members with specific areas of specialization, (.) because right now pedagogy instructors have to wear many hats and to be experts in many fields. And with multiple faculty members, then the (.) problems that I mentioned earlier giving supervision would also be filtered throughout several people in the program. So I think most schools are going to have problems with this "*big program*" that I am picturing because of teaching space, and piano faculty as well. I think that the piano faculty has to also feel that piano pedagogy is also an important component *rather than* only trying to get the very top pianists. I think that some schools have a (.) big problem in this area. I am happy that we do not. Everybody is sort of *unified* in what we want. But it is still a challenge just being able to recruit students, finding spaces, funding, students and everything.

R: In your opinion, what are the possible obstacles that may occur in establishing this idealized piano pedagogy program?

S: The number one that I see is *space* (.) because (my institution) is in the process of trying very hard to raise money to build new buildings. But, with the existing building that we have, (.) even we were to have said incoming class of 20 graduate students or whatever. Just having spaces for the existing faculty loads and also space for them to teach, we utilize every single room in this building. (.) Right now, we utilize *every* space, every hour and every day.

R: Any possible solution for this issue?

S: (N.n) No. That is all about money and funding. (.) I guess the only temporary solution is just to *comprise* and strive for excellence with the size that you can handle given faculty and resources, and also to try to maintain excellent standards of admission even though the size may not be huge.

R: So, (.) you say that money is the solution.

S: [Yes.

R: How to get quick money? Any quick way?

S: No::: as far as a building, (my institution) all relies on donators from the community, corporate-donators and things like that. We have staff people do *nothing* but raising money. (.) I think they are very good at it. A lot depends on how the economy is doing.

R: Some research studies have recommended providing *separate* degrees in piano pedagogy at both the undergraduate and graduate level. However, other studies have advocated combining performance and pedagogy degrees into one degree. In your idealized program, how would this debate be reflected in the piano pedagogy degree that you offered?

S: I think that probably the current trend is to *combine* them. It is probably a very efficient way of doing it. (.) As a pedagogy person, I feel it is a very important subject since all the piano majors will end up *teaching* whether they have had pedagogy or not. Therefore, I feel that the more training and preparation that we can give *them*, the better. Combining the two degrees together also enhances *recruiting*. (.) I think combining performance and pedagogy is something that we will probably do next year.

R: So you mean major in performance but take equal pedagogy courses.

S: No, I think major in piano performance and pedagogy. (.) Yes, I think it is what we will do. Once upon a time, the trend was to *separate*. Then I think it created a system of levels in which the performance major's level was *higher* than the pedagogy major's level. Somehow, it meant that the pedagogy majors were not as talented as performance majors. I think combining can erase the leveling and make the statement that we think that both are equally important. I think (.) majoring in piano performance and pedagogy will be the degree that we will offer in the future.

Interview with Subject M

R: (Subject M), thank you for your interview today. I'd like to let you know that your school piano pedagogy program was selected as one of the top 20 piano pedagogy programs in the country by a group of people. Now I'd like to ask you, could you please think about what kind of strengths led to this result?

S: OK. The strengths that led to this are, of course, due to my *predecessors*, who built this program before me; some are still here. Aspects of the program that they developed and some of the things I've *added* contribute to that. I think one of the things is that, for the *pedagogy students*, if we're talking just for the pedagogy students, would be the opportunities to *teach*, or the *teacher training* aspect of the program. (.) The students having *opportunities* to teach and the supervision of their teaching is an important aspect, because a lot of the undergraduates are teaching for the *first* time and the same for some of the graduate students as well. So I think having that hands-on experience, perhaps, is something that is *attractive* for them. (.) Keeping the curriculum-up-to date with current issues in piano pedagogy is also very important. My colleagues in piano, who are supportive of the pedagogy program, are *active* in performing, in teacher organizations (state and nationally). (N.n) Those things come to mind, right away. So, I think it's a *combination* of good faculty teamwork and the *opportunities* for students.

R: Congratulations.

S: Thank you. Like I said, I can't take all the credit for that *reputation* because I've only been here for 7 years.

R: That's a great deal already.

S: You know, I'm so surprised how *quickly* it goes by.

R: How *big* is your program?

S: As far as our ped program, our undergraduates? (N.n) Well I'll explain it this way. Our programs in *piano* for the undergraduates- undergraduates are performance majors, and they can *elect* to do *emphasis* in accompanying or teaching or just performance. And so all of the undergrads have to take at least *one* semester of pedagogy, those doing the pedagogy emphasis take *two* semesters. (N.n)

R: How big is your program?

S: (N.n) It can range from, (.) I think the most I've had in an undergraduate class is 10, and then the graduate students, they *all* take *two* semesters of pedagogy *unless* their emphasis is in collaborative piano, so I will have up to 13, and in pedagogy class, but as far as those *only* doing the emphasis in pedagogy, that has ranged from three to seven, six or seven.

R: So do you also have the students do an emphasis in piano pedagogy at the *doctoral* level?

S: We don't have a doctorate here.

R: Up to masters?

S: *Yeah*.

R: Now could you talk about the curriculum in your program, from the undergraduate first?

S: Sure. (.) Undergraduates, again, can take *two* semesters, and then they can take as many *practicum* semesters as they want, which is the *hands-on teaching*.

R: So the practicum is *separate* from the pedagogy course?

S: Yes, separate from the pedagogy course. Although, if I have a student who's in the pedagogy course but *not* in practicum, they still do some *teaching*. So it's optional for some of them, but

they all do teaching no matter which one. So that's what we have at the undergraduate. And the graduate is *similar*.

R: Two semesters?

S: Masters, *yes*, at the masters they have two semesters. (.) If they're pedagogy majors, they have three semesters of pedagogy, and then they take *four* practicums, so one practicum would be studio teaching at a *pre-college* level, group teaching at a pre-college level, and then *adult* studio teaching and then adult *group* teaching. They take one of each of those.

R: So what kind of *topics*, mainly, do you cover in your coursework?

S: Well, (.) we do, we start off with learning about the *principles* of teaching, and so I use Robert Duke's *essays*. (.) We cover things such as *sequencing*, *feedback*, I don't mean technology sequencing, I mean sequencing of *materials*, feedback, transfer, curriculum, assessment and evaluation, (.) They learn how to, using a computer program called *Scribe*, they learn how to systematically evaluate their own teaching. So that happens in *all* the courses every semester, they *evaluate* their own teaching. (.) Of course we do, we go through the elementary level, how to teach reading, how to teach rhythm, how to teach technique, or the different *approaches*. (.) Learning musicianship skills such as improvisation, harmonization and transposition, and that's how we *look* at the different series and materials that are out there. (.) We do the same thing for *intermediate* levels. (.) And with that they do *peer* teaching demonstrations, so we try to cover all *four* of the time *periods*. (.) So we do those peer teaching, and within the peer teaching they have to come up with some *historical* background of the composer and the time, creative activities that they would do with that, musicianship skills that they would *reinforce* with a piece, technique would go along with that, and then they teach it, (.) They present a *sequence* of how they would *teach* it.

R: I see, so is that mainly for one-on-one teaching, or both, group teaching too?

S: For the *intermediate level*, the one-on-one, we do talk about *group* teaching elementary, and they do observe that as well. (N.n).

R: So you mentioned about how the teaching component is very strong in your program. Could you talk about this more? How do your students get that experience? *Through* the coursework, or through other programs?

S: Well, through the *practicum*. (.) And if they're in pedagogy class, too, but not in the practicum, they're also *teaching*, so it could be, as far as the practicum, through our *creative* arts program, our pre-college program. They'll also be working with one of our schools, our pre-college schools here that are privately *run and owned*, and we're very lucky to have them just up the road and we'll be utilizing that for *observation* and extra *tutoring* as well. But at this point it has just been through our *prep* program.

R: How *big* is your prep program?

S: [It's not really that big, actually, in the past it had been quite large. so I have been trying to *incorporate* the group lessons with the prep program.

R: So your pedagogy students teach as faculty there?

S: Yes.

R: And do *undergraduate* students also teach there?

S: Right, the undergraduates are supervised in their teaching. (.) Yes, as are the graduate students.

R: Thank you. You mentioned technology earlier, could you please talk about how technology is *used* in your program?

S: (N.n) Well, as far as it is one of the *topics* that we cover, (.) one of the semesters undergraduate and graduate, and, just basic things about how studio piano teachers are using technology in their *studios*, whether it's digital keyboards, the computer software, kind of an *overview* of that, some of the *research* that is done on use of technology, and that's another thing that I try. I do *incorporate* a lot in *all* aspects of the curriculum, (.) is the *research* that's been done, so that's another aspect. (.) So technology, yes, is another topic.

R: So you have a special, a *separate* course, talking particularly.

S: No, *not* a separate course.

R: It's *covered* in your core courses.

S: Right.

R: So any, what kind of equipment do you use in your program? Tools, like digital piano sequencing, or Disclavier?

S: (n.n) Well, we have the Clavinovas, we do have a Disclavier, the computers, software, internet:::

R: Thank you. How are finances in your program? Do you have particular *funding* or a *budget* for the pedagogy program?

S: //No, no:::

R: Does the *prep* department help to generate money through that teaching?

S: //No, no:::

R: So finances are not good, then (hhh)?

S: No, that's exactly true. It helps tremendously when publishers send us free copies, when they are able to *give* to our pedagogy library, and that's why it's so important that publishers, such as Alfred or Faber, when they have new publications, will send those. And I *use* those in my pedagogy courses to keep current with materials, and when they give them to me for *free*, that's a big *help*, (N.n) The other part of my job is *coordinating* the group program, and that part I do have *funding*, and that part, that's where my *technology*, comes from. (.) Because I use it in group piano, and anything that I can use in group piano, I try to *transfer* over to the pedagogy courses. (.) But as far as asking for money, I wouldn't say that I'm not financially *supported*, you know what I mean (hhh) , I've not, I guess I've found *resources* except for materials. I'd love to get *more* resources for that, it's not been so *necessary*.

R: Now, how many pedagogy faculty members do you have in your program?

S: Well, (.) I'm the *only* one teaching pedagogy. Although I consider the piano faculty to be very supportive of the program.

R: So you're in charge of everything there?

S: Right, as far as the *curriculum*, right.

R: That's a *big* job.

S: It is a big job, you're right.

R: So what do you think, what kind of degree do you think is the *best* for being a pedagogy professor? Do you have any *preference*, or if you were going to hire another person, what type of person would fit this *position*?

S: Well that's an interesting question, because if I were to hire another person to work with me, I would probably hire someone that's *different*. Perhaps different *emphasis*. (.) My, I'm biased about my degree, because my terminal degree, the doctorate was in music ed with an emphasis in piano pedagogy, (.) and I think that's given me a *perspective* that I would not have otherwise, or, I wouldn't say better, but just a *different* perspective. (N.n) So I feel like that was a very good degree as far as teaching people how to teach. That, I feel very *good* about that. (.) Now if I

were to work with someone else whose emphasis was *not* that, I wouldn't think that would be a bad thing. I just, I think having people of different *ends* of the spectrum, or whatever, or different *experiences* or different training is *fine*. I wouldn't think someone who did a doctorate in piano performance pedagogy would be any *less* qualified than myself, I just find that I *draw* upon my training and experience and it being in music ed? (.) I draw on that *instantly* when I'm working with students on their teaching. (N.n) so as far as what's *best*, (.) I would be *biased* and say mine. (N.n) But I think if you had people, more than *one* pedagogy teacher, I think having diversity there would be nothing but *great* for the program.

R: Definitely. Thank you. (.) So we have talked about the instructors, the curriculum, technology, and finance. Which do you think is the *largest* challenges you are facing in your program?

S: That's a good question. (N.n) I think, (.) I'm constantly, *rearranging* and *adding* to the topics, such as the topics that I mentioned are only 2 of about *10* that I cover. (.) So I think my challenge, my biggest challenge I think is *preparing* students in *one* year, or sometimes *one semester*, (.) to give them *broad* enough experiences, yet in some ways they need the breadth and the depth of information, (.) or if I give them *too little* as far as the kinds of things they need to be aware of when they're teaching..., (N.n) if they were studio teachers, or whatever. But if you don't work on those particular sets of teaching skills *enough*, then all the knowledge of the methods and materials *aren't* going to do anything. They have to *develop*, to a certain level, a set of teaching skills. So I would think that *balancing* the breadth of knowledge that they get would be beneficial to them, with the *depth* of that material, (.) or the teaching skills, so that the knowledge is put to good use.

R: Yes, very important. (.) If you could *improve* your challenges, only one at a time, which would you like to change *immediately*?

S: If I could change *one* thing in the program? (.) Like curriculum, or just in general?

R: *General*, or particular, whichever, if you could improve your challenges one at a time?

S: (N.n) Oh my goodness, what comes to *mind* right away? (.) Well, and this would be impossible, I just need *more* time. (.) I would like to work with each student more.

R: *Supervision*?

S: Yes. *More*, (.) but when there are 13 students in your class, there's just *not* enough of you. (.) I try to meet with them watching their own teaching, which has *helped*, but I would love to spend *more* time with them *individually*. (.) It's as if you were teaching performance students, if you didn't *see* them individually. (.) It's that kind of skill that I would like to incorporate *more*.

R: Thank you. Supervision is what you would like to improve immediately?

S: Yes, I would like to do a *better* job at that.

R: Thank you so much, very nice. (.) Now let's go on to my second research question, which is your *vision* of the ideal piano pedagogy program. So if you were going to build up your own ideal program, what kind of picture would you *see* in your dream?

S: (N.n) So what would I have?

R: Yes. (.) What kind of curriculum, or what kind of program would you like to have?

S: I would say, *every* teacher's going to say this, to have them take *more* semesters of pedagogy.

R: Quite a *few*, that's right. It would take 10 years to complete this program.

S: *Absolutely*. (.) And again, that would go with the idea of *depth*, it would be, (.) their knowledge base would be deeper, (.) so that would be one thing. What would be *great* is if I were to think about the *end* goal, would be having a curriculum or a program set up to *where* the student, at the end of an undergraduate or graduate program would go right in place to *teaching*.

(N.n) That they would be well *prepared*, going into a teaching *setting*, (.) whether that's a pre-college group. If it's a college group, they could have their own studio by the time they graduated, and helping them *along* the way with that. (.) Probably just more *specialization* is a way to put it. And it would be great for *two* aspects that I would love to have incorporated for those *preparing* to teach piano, and those would be, *business* classes and more *music education-type* classes, psych from a music perspective, similar to some of the courses our undergraduate *music ed* students take. (.) So those two things, I think would be great. If there was such a thing as adding hours to a program, which, it would be very difficult to *add* hours to a program. So those two things, I think, would help in preparing students. And also, if they could *shadow* an independent teacher, or business owner, as far as someone who owns a conservatory or something like that.

R: Anything else?

S: Yeah, (N.n) how they could work within the *community*, or a part of the community, the musical community, at large and their *role* in the community. (.) You know, *teachers* or performers, or kind of a societal *view* of a teacher, those types of things.

R: So in the *process* of building up this ideal program, do you see any possible obstacles?

S: Well certainly, the amount, of adding *hours* to a degree program, and that would certainly be the *biggest* obstacle, and the amount of *time* that students are here and all of the other courses they take as part of their degree program in general.

R: So do you see any possible *solutions* for this, any compromises?

S: Perhaps being *aware* of workshops or, summer types of things they could participate in, (.) that's not a three hour credit or electives(.) but that could be a *possibility*.

R: Save some hours, that way students wouldn't need to study for a *long*, long time.

S: As you know (hhh). I know, I know, that's what it feels like, *absolutely*.

R: Thank you. I appreciate it. So my last question is, this question comes from research documents that have shown that pedagogy degrees should be *separated* from performance degrees, and some research has shown that they should be *combined* into one degree. So in your ideal program, what do you think is the *best*?

S: I understand that question. (.) I think that depends on where that student is. (N.n) My masters was in *performance*, and I think that was good timing for me because that's when I was developing those skills. (N.n) And my doctorate degree, even though it's in music ed with piano ped emphasis, I still took lessons and still continued working on those *skills*. That's where I was in my life. That's where I needed to be, I needed to be *doing* that. Not that anyone ever develops them to the point of, "OK I'm done." We're always *working* on that. (.) So I think, for instance, the undergraduates I have in pedagogy, I wouldn't dream of them not continuing developing their performance skills, because they're so *young*. That's when you do it, not that you would never. It's never *too* late. (.) But let's say someone who had at some point done a performance degree, maybe did a performance masters, and now wants a pedagogy emphasis, wants to *go back*, then perhaps their *skills* are already developed and they want to have the emphasis in piano pedagogy. Well *fine*, you know what I mean? I don't think it should be *one or the other*. If it's not there, then it needs to be developed. (.) If performance skills *aren't* developed, then they need to be, and then if they want to emphasize in pedagogy, well then *definitely*. It's *hard* to do both at the same time, but I just don't think you can do one without the other.

R: So it would be a *combined* degree? Or it depends on the situation?

S: I think *so*. Let's say if someone like myself who just went straight through, all school. For me I needed to be *developing* performance skills. And the *more* I got to the end of my pedagogy program, the more I was, specialized. But if I were where I am right now, and I wanted to do an *emphasis* in piano pedagogy but had gone through the whole *performance* track, well then why? And sometimes it's just *titles*, and until you look at the curriculum, or whatever, the title really doesn't always define the curriculum.

R: So you think that the *title* is not really the issue.

S: Right. I don't think anyone would say that no one *should* learn how to play the piano better at the beginning. I just don't. Even our music ed students *continue* developing their performance skills, because we're *growing* as musicians, not just as pianists.

R: So how about the bachelors?

S: Well, I certainly think they need to be developing their *performance* skills.

R: So no pedagogy emphasis at this point?

S: Well, I think, no, I think having *training* in piano teaching, learning how to teach piano is *certainly* fine at that level, I just wouldn't want it to be such a *pedagogy emphasis* that the performance skills are not being developed. (.) So, I think having both is fine, (.) especially when, at that age, they have that interest in teaching. (.) I get *excited* when the undergraduates get excited about teaching. It's just great because it's really *rewarding* to see them get all excited about piano teaching, so I think that's nice. So, that's a long way to answer that.

R: Very clear, thank you.

Interview with Subject N

R: (Subject N), thank you for your interview today, I'm *glad* to let you know that your piano pedagogy program has been selected as *one* of the top 20 piano pedagogy programs by a group of piano pedagogues. Now could you think about the *characteristics* that make your program so strong; what made people recommend your program as one of the top 20?

S: (.) Well I think a lot of it has to do with the fact that we have two *full* time pedagogy faculty, (.) and many colleges and universities just have one person, you know, trying to run the whole program, but we have two full time pedagogy faculty with very *diverse* backgrounds, and I think that's a real *strength* to our program, that our students can see that kind of *diversity*.

R: How *big* is your program, how many people, how many students?

S: Well, (.) our masters program is very small, at this point I think we only have, I think we have (.) *four* people in our masters program right now. We're going through an *enrollment* management program that has cut back on the number of graduate students that we can *admit* into the piano program in general, and so it *hurts* us in pedagogy. (.) The doctoral program, we try to keep that to no more than *five* in a year because we want everyone to have opportunities to (.) *teach*, you know, and so we don't want to have too many students.

R: So do you offer the pedagogy degree in the *bachelors* level?

S: No.

R: Only for graduate students?

S: We did have an undergraduate degree and we got rid of it.

R: Can you talk about why you got rid of it?

S: Well, (.) the faculty in general believe that, (.) at that level, at the undergraduate level, the students really *need* to be focusing on getting their *skills*, their piano skills in line and that really needs to be their main focus, rather than *specialization*. So there are undergraduate pedagogy *courses* that are offered, but there's not a degree program.

R: So you think that, for the bachelors degree, it's better to focus on performance, playing level, right? And then you offer the pedagogy degree at the *graduate* level, can I say that?

S: [Right, I think it's important for the undergraduate students to have pedagogy *courses*, I think it's *critical* that they have pedagogy courses, but at that level, I really feel that specialization is *not* needed.

R: I see, so you've talked about courses, could you talk about the curriculum content at your program, *through* the undergraduate level to the doctoral level?

S: Well, many of the levels have the same *emphasis*, it's just dependent on the *level* of the student that you're working with. (.) All of the courses, whether they be the one-on-one pedagogy courses or the group piano pedagogy courses, emphasize the *fundamental*, functional skills, fundamental skills for pianist to survive. (.) So it's, you're talking about physical, aural, and the *ability*, also, to read. So, *physical* adjustments, whether it's working with a *beginning* child and how you work with the *mechanism* that is so weak, and how you build that mechanism, or whether you're going all the way up to advanced pianists, where there are physical adjustments that need to be made (.) due to the *level* of the *repertoire*, or due to misuse of the physical mechanism earlier in their careers, or, you know, it just has to run the *gamut* of how the skills apply to students of various levels. (.) And the same with the ear training and the reading, these are addressed in *all* the courses, just pertaining to the level that you're working with at that particular *time*. (.) We also have, of course, pedagogical analysis of repertoire. *Not* necessarily

just method books, I mean the students do look at method books, but this is pedagogical analysis of repertoire, (.) sometimes by *period*. I know that my colleague does her repertoire analysis by *periods*, and does two periods per semester in a two-semester sequence. (.) Much of the repertoire that we do harmonic and formal analysis on in group piano pedagogy is a repertoire that you would *find* in group piano texts, (.) but also repertoire that you would find, that most people would consider what would be used for *one-to-one* instruction, but how you *adapt* that repertoire for a group teaching situation. There is no group pedagogy on the undergraduate level, (.) it is a course that is *reserved* for the masters and the doctoral students.

R: So how do those undergraduate students get group teaching experience?

S: At this time, they do *not*.

R: OK. (.) You were talking about *teacher training* earlier, because you were saying that the doctoral students, you wanted *everyone* to get enough experiences in teaching. Could you please talk about this part, this teacher training more? How do you train your students to get that teaching experience, through the coursework, or do you have a different *approach* to this?

S: It's *mostly* through the coursework. We do have something called *Piano Project*, which is age six through high school, and students in the undergraduate, one-to-one pedagogy that (person) teaches, get to work *with* Piano Project students, and in that way, they have *observed* teaching experience that happens in the Piano Project. *Graduate* students *also* teach with Piano Project, you know, different ages, and they *conduct* classes that are *theory* or repertoire classes and get some experience in that way. The graduate students *also*, in the pedagogy classes, have the chance to teach college, *non-music* majors in a one-to-one situation. The students who are in the group piano pedagogy class *do* role-playing, as far as teaching one another in the class, but then they also teach *modules* too, my group piano classes, that are, (.) a freshman level class and a sophomore level class. They have an *opportunity* to teach modules within the semester.

R: So they all get experience in one-on-one and group teaching, right?

S: *Yes*.

R: Thank you. I'd like to shift the topic a little bit. How is *technology* used in your curriculum?

S: You mean, other than the equipment that we use? Are you talking about *equipment*?

R: Equipment, and also how do you offer a particular course, a technology course for students to learn how to *utilize* those equipments, or do you have anything particularly on technology?

S: That is done within the *group* piano pedagogy. Which is taught *every fall*, and the topics in that course change, (.) so students are able to repeat the course if they would like, as the topics change from year to year. (N.n) A lot of it depends, the *amount* of technology that happens depends on the *level* of the students that I have within the class, and what I see as the *needs* of those students. But the areas of technology that are covered are, of course, the *digital* instrument, the control centers that are used to *manipulate* the instruments within the room, *computer* skills, we have *Dell laptops* for the teachers in each of the two labs, and a ceiling mounted projector, and the students must become proficient in using *PowerPoint* as a teaching tool, using the *visual music tutor* as a teaching tool, using MIDI disk as a teaching tool, those types of technology.

R: And also, do you have any particular *software* you assign the students to use, or any software that you favor?

S: (.) Well, *Microsoft PowerPoint*, and in order to create the PowerPoint tutorials, they need to be able to use either *Peak* or *Audacity* for capturing sound files. They need to be able to use either *Finale* or *Sibelius*, to get *manuscripts*, and of course they have to be proficient with word

processors. (N.n) We use Dreamweaver for learning to create websites, for the studio. Probably this fall we'll be using *Flash* as well.

R: Thank you. (.) I forgot to ask you one question earlier. What are the *required* textbooks that you use for your students?

S: In the pedagogy class?

R: Yes.

S: We don't have a required textbook. Not in the group pedagogy class. And I *don't* believe that Professor (person) uses a required course, either. We both use anything that is written, from *Well-Tempered* to *The Practical Pedagogy* of Marti Baker's, there's a new pedagogy text that has come out from Jeanine Jacobson, that I will probably *refer* to quite a bit, you know, and you continue to refer to the Bastien, it's just *all* these books that I have in my library, and they're available to students, (.) to check out. There's not a *required* text. (.) I give my students in the group pedagogy course, they all *receive* a copy of *Piano for the Developing Musician* so that we can use it within the class to do *functional* skill-type things. As far as required texts, there isn't.

R: Thank you. Can you talk about the *financial* situation in your program?

S: We have *no budget*.

R: [laughs] OK. How am I going to go through this? You have no control over this part?

S: Not at all (hhh).

R: That's very *clear*. OK, we talked about the curriculum, and finance, and technology, one more. In your opinion, if you are going to hire a piano pedagogy professor, what kind of *background*, what kind of *degree* do you think is the best for being a piano pedagogy professor?

S: Professor (person) and I *differ* on this. (.) (Person) feels that it should be people with performance degrees that have had *multiple* semesters of pedagogy instruction. (.) My ideal person for teaching a pedagogy program, would be someone who has a performance *undergraduate* major, a performance and pedagogy *masters*, (.) and a doctorate in pedagogy, preferably a doctorate that stresses (.) *research*. That would be my ideal person. Someone that has had *emphasis* on all three of the areas.

R: So performance level, pedagogy, research ability. Thank you. (.) We've talked about instructors, technology, and finance, which one do you think is the *largest* challenge you are facing in your program? Do you have any one?

S: Well, we really have *three*: The fact that we have *no* budget, the fact that our pedagogy courses are *not required* of all pianists, and the fact that we have this enrollment management that does *not* enable us to *recruit* at a level we would like to.

R: (.) You mentioned the three, if you could only improve one at a time, which one do you think you would like to deal with the most, *immediately*?

S: Probably to have the pedagogy courses required of *all pianists*.

R: So right now the pedagogy courses are not *required* of all pianists? They're electives?

S: No, I beg your pardon, no, (.) not for the *performance* students it's not.

R: So are you going to change this situation in the future?

S: I have no idea, I hope so, (.) I haven't so far.

R: Thank you. My next question is your dream about the ideal piano pedagogy program. If you were going to build up your own ideal piano pedagogy program, what kind of picture would you dream about, what kind of picture is in your mind?

S: (N.n) Probably to have a *four* to six course requirement. (.) Four to six semester requirement for all pianists.

R: *Why?*

S: *Why?* (.) Because of the amount of *variety* you would be able to present in a program, particularly if you had at least *two* of those courses that were topics courses, that could *change*, you know, (.) that would be a wonderful program. (.) I would also like to *incorporate* the group instruction in the *lab* situation with the Piano Project program and at this point it is *not* incorporated.

R: Anything *else* in your dream?

S: I'd have a *budget*, (.) that would be nice.

R: If you were going to build up this program, would you see any *obstacles* you would be facing in order to accomplish this dream?

S: (.) Our tight degree programs, the fact that there's no *room* in the degree programs to add things, that's the *largest* obstacle.

R: Do you have any ideas or possible *solutions* for this?

S: *No*, just as faculty change, you try to *enlist* the support of other faculty. (.) Change is a very scary thing to most people, so, (.) you know, you have to work at it little by little.

R: That's true. My last question is, (.) in your ideal program, this question comes from some research that has suggested that pedagogy degrees should be separated from performance degrees, and some research has suggested that they should *combine* together into one degree. In your philosophy, what kind of *degree* do you think is best, from the undergraduate up through the doctoral level?

S: Well, I've already said that on the undergraduate level, it should be a *performance* degree, at the graduate level, I think it's helpful for it to be a performance and pedagogy *combination*. On the doctoral level, I think both need to be *available*, for students to choose.

R: You think it should be separate, and also a combined degree, *too*?

S: Yes. I mean, students need to be able to, if you've got students who are really, really, *really* strong performers, and have also *done* a performance and pedagogy degree at the masters level, then I think on the doctoral level I think it would be wonderful for them to go into a research program that is more just *straight* pedagogy, (.) but I think it's really critical that both of those *types* of degrees *survive* on the doctoral level so that students do have that option.

R: One more, just to go back a little bit, you said a four to six semester requirement in your dream, can I know, how many *courses* do you offer in your program right now?

S: In our program right now, we have only *two* undergraduate courses in pedagogy, and (.) we have three graduate courses, plus, (.) in just straight pedagogy, in our pedagogy doctoral program, of course, there are *several* courses that are within *music and human learning* that are required of our pedagogy students, so you know, there is a huge offering when you combine all of those, (.) *plus* our students are able to do *directed* research, individual projects with us, with the pedagogy faculty, and those can *specialize* in either one-to-one instruction or group instruction.

R: OK, thank you, we're done.

Interview with Subject O

R: (Subject O), I would like to let you know that your school's piano pedagogy program has been selected as one of the *top 20* programs in the United States by a group of people. I'd like to ask you, could you *imagine* what are the reasons that *make* your program so strong?

S: (.) I think it's because how we have *restructured* it. Originally, it was offered in conjunction with (school). (.) We were with them for many, many years, and after she passed away, the decision was made to *stop* the program for a variety of reasons, this gave us a couple of years to *revamp* and restructure the program to incorporate the new idea. We felt it was a great program, but at this time we also wanted to have greater *diversity* and different *approaches* towards teaching. We therefore established the graduate program based on the concept that all our courses are *team taught*. We don't believe there is just *one* philosophy towards teaching, so that, for instance, the graduate program, the first semester is taught by *two* teachers, the second semester is taught by *two* different teachers, so that they are getting a *wide*, different range of *philosophies* and *approaches*.

R: Very unique.

S: Well, it is very *unique*, and our undergraduate program is like that also. The other strong thing that we developed that makes it very, *truly* unique, is that the second year students have the opportunity to select *internships* with different teachers. Here again, they can choose from as *many* as, well, I think we've had at least *10* different teachers involved, depending on the student's area of *interest*, so we want students to *graduate* having had a chance to sample many different *specialties*. (N.n) So to give you an idea of the kind of range, I have a studio of private students of very *gifted* kids, who do lots of competitions and auditions, it might be, like one student, two students who are just preparing for a master class to play for (*person*), playing concerti with orchestra at 10 years old, so I've had many students who *elect* that for one of their internships. Another colleague, (*person*), has a private studio of *adult* students, so students can select that as an internship. There are others who select *group* piano as an internship so they can get more *group* experience. We've had people work on, with somebody just dealing with the *psychology* of music, preschool music, a traditional school, so that whatever they want to do, oh, some students have worked with *college* students, so that their internships are very *personalized*, and that's, I think that is *different* from any school, that they can have that kind of a *wide* range, so students that want to come to a school and *not* just get beginning and intermediate level teaching, get to work with adults, preschool, anything they want.

R: This is very nice, because this is the first time I've ever heard about this kind of *personalized* program.

S: Oh, it is *extremely*, and some of them even *split* their internship hours. For instance, one of my students this semester, she wanted the experience of working with college students, so she did one part of her internship with me and another part with another college teacher 'cause she wanted to *experience* what it was like to see another college teacher, and so one, she was starting on *new* repertoire with my students, and another was getting polished for her masters *recital*. (.) So it was a very different experience.

R: So you have talked about internships. So are your pedagogy students actually being assistants for the program?

S: (.) Well, it *depends* on what they're doing, how the internship is set up. (.) My students, who are *working* with me, they come and observe, and one time a week they also get the opportunity of working with a gifted student, and their lesson is videotaped, and then I *critique* the videotape,

or they come and teach in front of me. So every internship is designed differently. But I say, what's the best part is that students have the opportunity to *explore* the areas that they think are important. For instance, one of my students next year, she's not good at *sight reading*, she's a wonderful teacher, but she herself has major deficiencies in sight reading. I've recommended she study with (person) to do her internship with her, learning more sight reading techniques, because that's an area where she's weak, and (person) has expertise. (.) And then the second semester she wants to work more on *technology* with me and learn how to use the Disklavier. Everyone is *different*.

R: So how many faculty do you have in your program?

S: Well, quite a few *adjuncts*. For fulltime, it's me, (person), and (person), so we are always involved. But we have many *adjuncts* that are connected with it, (person), (person), (person), (person) have been attached. Several of the class piano teachers have been attached. There have been conservatory teachers, so it's *very* one-to-one.

R: How *big* is your program?

S: It depends on the *year*. I would say the average, next year, for instance, we will have seven incoming students, (.) but this year there were only four, the year before that there were six. I would say the average is *six* in a class.

R: That's nice. And you offer the different degrees from the bachelors to the doctoral?

S: No, no doctoral. We have a bachelors in piano, and we have three undergraduate pedagogy courses, which is also *quite* unique. Most schools do not have three.

R: Most schools have *two*.

S: Right, and we have three, so there again, it's *very comprehensive*.

R: So you have a bachelors degree in piano pedagogy and a masters?

S: The bachelors degree is called *Piano*, but the piano majors will take the three pedagogy courses, It's just called piano because we try to have a *comprehensive* piano degree. So they're taking, pedagogy, taking piano accompanying, and taking piano literature. (.) The graduate degree is called pedagogy and performance, or performance and that's also a *very* important distinction for me about our program, that there's a *strong* performance element, that it's not just a masters in pedagogy. (.) We expect them to be *strong* performers as well.

R: Yes, combined, together. OK, I'd like to ask you about the curriculum. Could you talk more about the courses you offer, the *content*?

S: Here's what I'm going to recommend, for the first semester course, I'd recommend you talk to (person) who teaches that course. I could give you my perspective, but I think you'd get a *more* accurate description since she's been teaching that course for years. I teach the second semester, which is called (*course*). What makes that course quite unique, is that something called our *Top 50 list*. The list includes the top 50 pieces that we think every piano teacher should know how to *play* and *teach*, so the students are required to learn all 50 pieces, know how to introduce the piece, what kind of preparatory work they should be doing for the students before they start the piece, *breaking down* all the technical problems for the students, as well as address what are the *greatest* musical and technical challenges of the piece, and be able to perform it at a *high* artistic level. (N.n) So we do a lot of discussion of *breaking down* technical problems, but also a big discussion on *style*. (.) And obviously as an author, we use my text for that. We have written a new series of three books that really gives students an understanding of style. (.) The format we use for assignments is the original book I wrote many years ago with (person), (.) which, again, has *preparatory exercises*, creative practice techniques, and how to polish repertoire. And in addition to that, we talk about other aspects of style. There will be an

entire style lecture, let's say, on impressionism, or how to teach sonatinas. (.) And so, there's a lot of other music discussed, but the *core* of that course is our top 50.

R: And can you talk about the courses for the *graduate* level?

S: That course I just discussed is the masters, the second semester. The first semester of the masters, (person) teaches either with (person) or (person), the second semester I teach with (person) and next year I'll teach it with (person). That is our *second* semester pedagogy course at the graduate level. I thought you were more interested with the graduate level.

R: *Both*.

S: That was the graduate. Very quickly. (.) First semester undergraduate is two part, what I call a *smorgasbord* course. It sort of covers everything because we have *music education* majors that just take one semester, so we want to make sure they get everything. There's a lot of *emphasis* on looking at beginning *methods*. One of my colleagues does that, looks at a whole *wide* range of all the standard methods, Clark Faber and Faber, Pace, (.) the standard stuff. At the same time, that semester, I do many different lectures, an introductory one on *technique*, how to *audition* students, one or two classes on *preschool* music, *creating* motivation, creating good lesson assignments for students, I said technique already, how to get students ready for *workshops* and *recitals*, so, and you know, there's some lectures on style. So just, basic overview. (.) Second semester is much more, in the undergraduate program, again, similar to dealing with early *intermediate* repertoire. They have a *top 20* that they do, so it's less music and it's early intermediate, and again how to breakdown. It's a *similar* kind of approach to the graduate study but at a much simpler level. It *culminates* with them doing some kind of a lecture recital at the end. Third semester in the undergraduate is dealing with *group* piano techniques and the *adult* students. So you can see our undergraduate program, it's more *comprehensive*, I feel, than some graduate programs, between you and me. It's *very* comprehensive, so they come out with a really *solid* foundation.

R: But they are more focused on a one-on-one setting, right? Private studio?

S: Well most of it is, but the *second* semester is definitely. Half of the third semester is *devoted* to group teaching.

R: I see, so even the undergraduate students are getting the experience of a group lesson, too, right?

S: Absolutely, *absolutely*. Because they get beginning level students, and they start doing, with some teacher *supervision*, they're doing some teaching.

R: So you talked about earlier, I'd like to go back to the *internship*. Those undergraduate students also have the *chance*?

S: No, no, that's graduates.

R: Only for *graduate* students.

S: Right.

R: So the undergraduate students get teaching experience through the coursework, can I say that?

S: [Yes, through the coursework, but those students that, after they do *well* in the second semester of pedagogy, they can be *recommended* to be *junior* faculty at our conservatory. The community music school, so next year, for instance, (.) I believe we'll be recommending *three* of the undergraduates next year to be teaching at the conservatory, so they'll actually become teachers.

R: So they get a lot of experience through those?

S: A *tremendous* amount of experience. They're good.

R: Yes, so what kind of textbook do you mainly use for the undergraduate level?

S: Texts? OK, well obviously, we're going to use *my* book, like I said. I mean, we use similar books, we just don't go up higher, as far as the beginning methods, let me just look here, and make sure I give everything to you. We'll definitely use the *Clark and Pathways*, and *Pace*. And we'll also use now the new *Alfred's beginning method*. (.) We use, well like I said, *Keys to Stylistic Mastery*, *From Mystery to Mastery*, and Phyllis Lehrer's, *Master of Classics*. That would be pretty much it. (.) So it's the same level book, but then of course we have the graduate students reading, you know, they'll have many *more* resource books, like the Jane McGrath, the Albergo Alexander book, and *Practical Pedagogy*, the Mary Baker-Jordan. You know, the standard pedagogy texts.

R: Yes, thank you. Now I'd like to, since you have so many *different* backgrounds of different faculty members here, I'd like to ask you about your personal opinion of their background. What kind of degree, or I should say what kind of background do you think is *best* for teaching a piano pedagogy course?

S: What's the best background? (.) Well everything is so different these days, because, for instance, (.) none of us have our doctorate. We're all older. Everybody's in their late fifties and early sixties, with the exception of (person), who has his doctorate in music history. (.) So, to me it's *hard* to say what would be the best degree, because none of us have it, we're just very *experienced* teachers who really loved teaching, and my true *passion* is teaching *how to teach*, but I do not have a degree in it.

R: I mean, would you prefer it to be *pedagogy* major, or a performance major?

S: I would prefer somebody who comes from a performance and pedagogy background combined. (N.n) I do not feel good about just a pedagogy degree, and I don't feel good about a performance degree, which is why we *call* it pedagogy and performance.

R: I see. Thank you so much. How about, how are the *finances* in your program? How do you get those funds, and how does the budget *distribute* to your program?

S: I have *no* idea, I can not even answer that. When I need to order something like, I needed a new DVD recorder, I videotape all my lessons, but that's something I've been doing all my life, and now I just put it in and magically I was able to get it. (.) But there *isn't* a lot of money, but really, even though I'm the head of the department, I sort of have to go to the dean to ask if I want something special, (.) like to bring in an outside visiting artist or something like that. But I'm *not* very involved in the whole financial aspect of it.

R: I see, but when you need it, you apply and it comes?

S: Yes, I go to the dean and ask, and then some things I can get and some I *can't*.

R: That's normal.

S: Yup, so we'll see.

R: Thank you. Now, I'd like, you talked about videotapes and *technology*, how is technology used in your program?

S: [That is one area where we need to all *grow* even *more*. (.) I am currently using more, I have always videotaped lessons, and I think that's very *important* for students, and I *encourage* my students, for instance, when they do an internship to videotape themselves teaching, and then to observe *themselves*, and then I'll watch the videotape and we'll *compare*, what did we both see, if we see the same thing. The other way I am using *technology* now is I am trying to get more comfortable using the *Disklavier*, (.) but I still have a lot to learn about that. However like I said, (.) I know one student wants to do an internship with somebody on technology, and I'm actually

going to recommend that she do it with someone other than me because I want her to have somebody who's much *more* knowledgeable in that area. It's an area we need to grow, still.

R: So you have somebody who's specialty is technology?

S: We have somebody who has done more with *technology*, yeah, but next year for instance I'm bringing in two different people to do some different courses, to do an all day *seminar*, two different seminars with the graduate students so they can learn more about technology.

R: Thank you. (.) So far we've talked about curriculum, instructors, finances, and technology and internships. So in your program, which do you see as the largest challenge you are facing? Is there any one that you mentioned that you would like to *improve*?

S: Greatest challenge. I'd say we still have to improve more with getting students more familiar with *technology*, I'd say that's where we are the weakest. I would say that's *definitely* our weak area.

R: Technology, you'd like to improve?

S: I think it's *important*. I mean, we don't use it that much, but I think for teachers today, they'd better know *more* about technology, 'cause that's what students want to learn.

R: So if you had the chance to improve one challenge at a time, immediately, which *one* would you chose to improve right away?

S: [*Technology*, that's why I'm bringing in outside people next year to help train them.

R: So, can I know more about the *two people* that you are going to bring in, and what kind of technology are they going to demonstrate?

S: Oh they do *everything*. George Litterist, and Kathleen Riley, they are two of the *top* people who present at MTNA and every single conference. They are two of the *leading* authorities in incorporating the Disklavier and workshops. (.) So if I knew more, I could tell you more, but right now I know that they're going to *help* work with the students and teachers in this *community*.

R: Now I'd like to go to my second research question, which is your *dream* of the ideal program. If you were going to build up an ideal program, what kind of *picture* would you see, what kind of picture would you *dream* about?

S: [*Exactly* what we have now, which is why we created this, I guess it was about five years ago. We *created* what we think is the ideal program for students, so that's the good part!

R: That's *nice*!

S: I think it's great. (.) I mean, in my *fantasy* I would love if we had more studios is the only thing I would do differently, I wish the students had access to, (.) you know, *better* teaching studios with equipment and a *better* pedagogy library, but as far as the curriculum in the program, I *love* what we've got. (.) You know, it's really *terrific*. Maybe add on one more course, but even there, we *created* something new, we have a weekly Pedagogy Lab for the grad students, that the students call *Group Therapy*. They can come in for one hour a week, and discuss *any* of their teaching problems, or a general issue, and I feel like we created it based on their request (.) so I'm *happy*.

R: So do you see any obstacles in this process?

S: Obstacles? *No*, I mean our *greatest* obstacle is that we don't have enough money to give people full assistantships and things like that, so that's the only thing I'm sad about. Other schools have *lots* more money and sometimes there's a great student and they'd love to come to study with one of us, but they *can't* afford it because we're not giving them as much money as other schools, so that's my *biggest* obstacle.

R: So do you have any *possible* solution for this in the future?

S: No, I keep working with *financial aid* to try to get the better students and try to come up with more money for assistantships, so I can *keep* trying, (N.n) but that, you know, money is money and I can't pull it out of the air. (.) But I would say, there again, last year they were *very* slow in getting back, we lost several *key* people last year because they were too slow and I made a big stink about it. And this year our assistantships went out right away, and I can tell you, this is what's *amazing*, we had such a good group, *every* single kid of the seven that applied, they all got in, and they're all coming. We have *100%*.

R: That's nice.

S: Yup, so we were *very* pleased.

R: Congratulations, that's why your program is so strong and is being recommended.

S: Like I said, this year I was happier, because I could go to admissions and say, the financial aid people, I said, "I want to show you the following *e-mails* from people who wanted to come here, but you were *late* in getting the packages out so we *couldn't* attract them."

R: The last question, probably you have already answered already. The *ideal* degree. Some research suggests a combined performance and pedagogy degree, and some suggests separate degrees. I think I know your answer already.

S: [Well, here is the thing about (school) that you need to understand, we do have a masters in performance also, so those that *really* aren't interested in teaching, they want to go on *more* for their doctorate, or they're just not sure, they really don't want to. (.) But I have had many people, who I have encouraged to *take* the pedagogy, at least the second semester, the repertoire course, because I say whether you want to teach or not you will *probably* need to know that repertoire, 'cause even if you end up getting a college teaching job, *many* of the students will be playing that repertoire. (.) So to me, the ideal, there should not be a *separate* masters in pedagogy, I *don't* believe in it at all because that's in a way saying, well you can *teach* but you don't have to be able to *play*. (.) To me, performance and pedagogy is the *ideal*, (.) but there's still *room* for a masters in performance degree, but *not* a masters in pedagogy.

R: But how about *doctoral*, what would you recommend?

S: (.) I would *still* say pedagogy and performance or performance and pedagogy. I think it gives the *wrong* message.

R: Thank you.

S: Perfect. (.) For the beginning part where I said about restructuring the course, in any way I don't want it to sound *negative* to the old program, so I want that to be listed *correctly*. (.) It worked, and it worked for many years, and it was *successful*, but after, I'm not sure how many years that was, it was probably over 20 years, it was time to *revisit* and *create* our *dream* curriculum.

R: Yes, I understand. Thank you so much.

Interview with Subject P

R: (Subject P), I'm glad to let you know that your piano pedagogy program was selected as one of the *top 20* piano pedagogy programs by a group of people, and now I'd like to invite you to think about what kind of features *make* your program so strong and caused it to be selected.

S: (.) Ok, I think there are several factors. I think we are fortunate to not only *have* a very strong faculty, but the faculty also get *along* very well here. Even students who come to study pedagogy are *always* still interested in studying applied piano. That's always really important to them. (.)

The applied teachers get along well. The piano pedagogy teachers are very *well* integrated into the entire piano faculty. (.) For instance, as the piano pedagogy instructor, I attend *all* the recitals, and piano labs. Many of our applied piano faculty will come to our piano pedagogy events. We get along very well, and there's a lot of *integration* within the program. There's no *infighting* between studios. I think that produces a healthy environment for students. (.)

Secondly, we offer a number of different degree programs. At the masters level, we offer *both* the MM in piano performance pedagogy, plus an MME degree with an emphasis in piano pedagogy, plus a straight MM *performance* degree. It *varies* year to year. Sometimes you would think our MM program would be the most popular, and it largely is, but there are some years we have an *unusually* large number of very strong performers who pursue the *MME* program. (.) At the *doctoral* level, there is both a DMA in performance pedagogy, plus a Ph.D. program. Both are very popular, plus a DMA performance degree. I think the *multiplicity* of degrees...gives students a lot of choice. (.) They have more than one option. We are very fortunate that there are *two* of us who teach piano ped courses. That's not all we do. I also *supervise* group piano, and the other pedagogy instructor teaches *applied* piano. Because there are two of us, we are able to offer several electives, and that's *attractive* I think, and healthy for students. Also, *both* the masters and doctoral programs have enough *flexibility* in the program that students will take electives in music theory and musicology. They have to take a certain number of pedagogy courses, but *no one* takes *all* of our pedagogy courses. They will often fill up their electives with extra theory courses, or extra history courses. We'll actually encourage them to do that. We're fortunate that our history and theory faculty are *large* enough that they're offering specialty courses, not just *core* survey courses. I think students have a lot of choices in terms of what they're *interested* in. They can hopefully pursue a special area, and they're not all taking the *same* courses as they go through, and I think that produces a *lively* environment.

R: Yes, it seems that your programs provide a lot of different *opportunities*.

S: [Yes, we thrive, we work hard, we try to I think *the entire* piano faculty works hard to try to encourage every student to work towards their particular interest or *need*, (.) Each student has their particular thing they want to try to learn more about or *pursue*- and we *try* to tap into that, and *accommodate* that to our best ability. Whenever I say that I always feel that *probably* if I said that in front of all our students, some of them would say "well, that may not always work for everybody." But it's something we *attempt* to make happen. (N.n) I think simply that we attempt it. Hopefully that gets conveyed to students. (N.n) I think the program has a long *history*, and because of that *long history* we now have a large *collection* of research materials. The program started out with very few. That has gradually been built up over time. (.) I don't think that's the *deciding* factor, but that's a nice aspect, a healthy aspect.

R: Certainly. So, do you have *two* faculty teaching in your piano pedagogy program, right?

S: Yes. (.)Our loads are not comprised full-time with pedagogy *courses*. I coordinate the group piano program. I *also teach* group piano, in addition to teaching pedagogy courses. The other instructor teaches pedagogy, and also teaches *applied* piano. We're not *strictly* pedagogy.

R: Yes. So, how *big* is your program? How many students at the different levels?

S: (N.n) When students interview, and they ask that same question, this is my standard response. We have a *little* under 50, around 48 students studying applied piano every semester. 9.) We will have some doctoral students who maybe aren't studying piano, but they're still in residence, and some of the Ph.D. students are not always studying piano. MME students aren't always studying in their second years. (.) In *reality*, we might have 55. One of our faculty said 60 and I thought 60 was kind of a top number. (.) That's everybody, that's undergraduate, doctoral, every conceivable piano degree.

R: It's *big*.

S: (.) Undergraduate students, we may have anywhere around 20 undergrad students, or 24, 25 (.) probably tops. I usually tell graduate students, and this is including masters and doctorate, that we usually have around 25. Those numbers *aren't* quite adding up right. That's people studying piano in any one given semester. That's just kind of a *rough breakdown*, we honestly don't track it. I don't quite know how to give you precise numbers.

R: Yes, just general numbers.

S: Just general numbers.

R: That's a big program, compared to other schools. Do you offer the pedagogy degree from undergraduate all the way up to the *doctoral*?

S: Yes. But we *don't* have as many undergraduate pedagogy majors. That really varies. Some years we have recently, we had kind of a cohort of 3 or 4 go through, right now we only have 1 or 2 *per year* majoring in pedagogy. (.) In all honesty, in our undergrad program, a lot of our students are *BMA students*. (.) A few are BM performance students, a *fewer* number are BM pedagogy students. The *majority* of our undergraduate students opt for one of the other degrees, rather than a pedagogy degree.

R: Can you talk about the *curriculum content* that you offer in your program from the undergraduate to the doctoral level?

S: (.)At the undergraduate level, all of the BM performance majors and the BM pedagogy majors *all* have to take a *one* year pedagogy class. All performance majors are *required* to take one year of pedagogy. With that is coupled a *demo program* so that they get actual practical experience teaching. In the second year, it is only the pedagogy majors who *continue on* to the second year in the demo program- (in the first year they had one student, there was usually a faculty or doctoral student teaching a *group* class; all of the young kids were in a class).

Undergraduate majors begin *teaching* the group classes in the *second year*. Basically the second year is just *teaching*, highly supervised teaching. The third year, they actually take the graduate pedagogy class. That's basically the *curriculum* for the undergraduate ped majors.

(.) At the graduate level, both masters and doctoral students take a *one-year* pedagogy class together called graduate pedagogy. I teach one semester, and the other pedagogy instructor teaches the second semester. (.) *Beyond* that, every degree has different requirements for how much pedagogy beyond that they take. In terms of what we *offer*, both of us who teach pedagogy, we both teach one graduate ped course a semester. (.)I teach the required pedagogy course in the fall, and in the spring I teach a graduate elective course. With those elective courses, we *rotate*. (.) One year I'll teach one course. The second year I'll teach a different course. So between two instructors, we're offering four graduate elective courses, which students

can *take* during their second year and third year. Like I said, *no* one ever takes all of the graduate electives. They either don't have time, or they want to take other things. Those classes tend to be a little bit smaller, depending on the topic.

R: Can you talk about the general *topics* that you offer?

S: Sure. We *tailor* the courses to whatever we feel like teaching. Every other year I teach- "piano teaching ensemble," We examine and play a *lot* of educational duets, three at one piano, piano quartets, two piano, keyboard ensembles, any *combination* of piano ensemble. The second half of the semester we look at a standard piano duet and duo piano repertoire. The second class I teach, I haven't taught it as frequently, I call it *applied research*. This is more geared towards doctoral students and I teach it more like a seminar course. Every student picks a *topic*, and basically reads research in that area. The goal is to come up with a paper or workshop or some sort of tangible product after reading the research. The other elective courses that are offered are current *trends* and intermediate piano *literature*.

R: How about the topics for *undergraduate*?

S: In the first semester, or *first year*, we try to cover obviously, elementary methods, that's a *huge* topic. *Business* and studio policies, is another large component... leveling of music, another important topic that takes time to develop. Then in second semester, (.) getting into *intermediate*-level repertoire, examining repertoire series, (.)and group teaching. Those are the *big topics* *although*- there are more *specific* topics, within that- but I'd say those are the big, *large* areas.

R: Up to graduate level, you cover the ensemble, *expand* to it.

S: (.) In that *first year* graduate ped course, I cover methods again, and quite a bit of time on group teaching materials, particularly at the *college* level. And technology. I also cover technology at the *undergrad* level. (N.n) *Teaching* group piano, I spend *more time* with that at the graduate level than I do at the undergraduate level.

R: So, can I say you focus more on one-on-one at the undergraduate level?

S: At the undergraduate level, in the first year, probably focuses more on *one-on-one* teaching children. The graduate level- we do spend time talking about teaching children, particularly methods, but I also focus on *college* group teaching, and a lot of the teaching techniques are really geared towards group *adult* teaching. Teaching group piano at the *college* level. Second semester intermediate level repertoire. *Master class* teaching is covered, resumes. Probably one of the unique things in the doctoral program is that the DMA students have the *option* of doing five hours of workshops in place of one of their *recitals*. Many of them do opt to do that. That's particularly useful, developing workshops that they can begin to use professionally.

R: What *kind* of workshops do they do?

S: It's completely up to *the students*, *with faculty input*, *of course*. They have to find a topic that they feel they know something about, or are *interested* in learning about and then be able to talk about. (.)It would mirror pretty similarly to what you might see at an *MTNA* convention. Some will be on technology, some will be on teaching children, some will be on teaching groups, some will be on ensembles, some will be on teaching *improvisation* or teaching *sight reading* with a particular slant of focus.

R: It just depends on the *individual*.

S: Yes

R: Ok. So, you mentioned a *demo* program earlier. Can you talk about this a little more?

S: We run that- how big that is is completely dependent on *how many* undergraduate students we have in our class. (.) So, it really depends on how *large* a group of students, undergraduates, we're going to have. (.) We try to have an *equal* number of young children, so every

undergraduate will be paired up with a child. Sometimes we'll accept one or *two extra* students, knowing that maybe one of our masters students might be interested in getting a little more experience with teaching young children. (N.n) Then the students, the young children, have a group lesson once a week and they have a private lesson with an undergraduate student once a week. We *interview* students. They have to be *highly committed*, as the parents normally bring them in twice a week.

R: I see. Are those students from your prep program?

S: We do *not* have a prep program.

R: I see.

S: We *advertise* in the university, so oftentimes it is faculty children, or just children from the *community*.

R: So, that is the way your pedagogy students *gain* their teaching experience?

S: Yes. That is the primary means for *undergraduate students*. The graduate students, not all of them, but many of them hold a teaching *assistantship*, so they are gaining their teaching experience through the *assistantship*. If they have a piano assistantship we try to split that between group teaching and private teaching, so they're getting experience teaching group *plus* private. Some students, say they have a music *appreciation assistantship* or something where they're not getting piano teaching experience, then, sometimes they can *enroll* for an internship teaching. I- every semester, I keep teaching a group piano class *myself*, and I've been *team-teaching* it with a grad student, I may team teach it with one, two, or three students. Sometimes students who aren't getting any *experience* teaching, they'll want to do that with me, or they aren't getting enough experience group teaching, or if people are having *trouble* teaching I'll recommend that. Sometimes people are good teachers, they just want to get a little *more* guided experience. We do all the *planning together*. It takes *a lot of* time on their part, but it's very much a guided experience- we work very closely for a semester. That's *one way* students gain experience if their graduate assistantship is not giving them direct teaching experience- and we have students who come with *no* assistantship- sometimes they will elect to do the *internship teaching* to gain experience.

R: I see. So that's for their *group teaching* experience.

S: [That's right, (N.n) private teaching experience. If they have a piano assistantship, then we offer- we call it *secondary* applied teaching. They're teaching college level students, usually those students are playing intermediate level repertoire, maybe *more* advanced. We *don't* specifically offer anything for our graduate students teaching *young* children. Consequently, some of them who really *want* to keep teaching young children, many of them- I've seen this in more recent years, it varies year to year- particularly students who end up staying *around* quite awhile, some of them will open up *studios*. Or they'll teach a few students on the side.

R: Ok. So those students get all of their teaching experiences either one-on-one or group teaching, right? Through different resources, like the *demo program* is mainly for undergraduates, right? Then for graduate students, they learn group teaching through *assistantship*, observing, or-

S: //Or, their assistantship typically will *include* that they teach two classes themselves. Many of them have that *assistantship*.

R: With your *supervision*.

S: Right. Supervision means I *watch* two teaching tapes a semester of theirs. In the first year, because many of them are *new* to teaching, I *share* my lesson plans with them, and sometimes I will meet with them early on in the semester or maybe after half a semester or so.

R: So that's a *lot* of work for you to do.

S: Yes. The supervision takes *quite* a bit of time. (.) But they're usually interested in the teaching and *improving* their teaching, so... they're very *interested*.

R: I'd like to go back to the topic that you mentioned earlier, *technology* that you offer in your courses. How is technology used in your program?

S: (N.n) I've done various things with it. It just depends- what I'm *interested* in doing, what's new, what I feel we need to work on. We just installed a *new* keyboard lab this fall, throughout the semester, so in my grad ped course, I *require*- I *vary* this every year, I'll vary it again- this year, the keyboards were so *new* and so different, I *divided* up every aspect of the new keyboards- sequencing, using multiple sounds, recording- and everyone *chose* one aspect of the keyboard to learn about and then, they had to *teach* us how to use it. I put them into groups, and they had to come up with *teaching applications*, either for young children or in a group piano class. They divided themselves up and each group took a different topic, a different aspect of the keyboard, and then gave a group presentation. It actually was a lot of *work* for them. Learning that aspect of the technology took a lot of time, and they essentially gave a *workshop* on it, had to give *teaching applications* as well. All of that was a ton of work. (N.n) We are making the transition from videotape to *digital* taping of our teaching. That has taken a lot of time because the camcorders, require time to learn how to use. You have to learn how to *download* the digital tape and edit your tape. All of that is a big learning process. (.) Last year I gave students the option of just using VHS video tape. That's actually *easier*. The first semester maybe a fourth of the students opted to digitally record their teaching. By the second semester it was half-and-half. (.) We'll *gradually* transition into only digital, but we're doing it pretty gradually. Some students are very motivated, to learn how to use it as they want to transfer their teaching to a DVD format. Others, it just currently feels like *too much time*, so we're letting students pick and *choose* what they want to do at this point. At some point we'll make a *full* transition but I doubt if we'll make that full transition this year. It's probably another year away.

R: I think that takes a *personality*, too.

S: Some people are *really* interested, or they think they want to learn it. Other people aren't as interested. Pretty soon, the whole world will be *switched* over, but we're not completely switched over yet.

R: Is there any *software* you prefer or that you recommend they use when you are teaching technology?

S: Various times we'll run projects in our courses where they have to *review* software, like Music Ace, software programs that you would use in your teaching *studio*. (N.n) We try to have a pretty wide range available for students. I would say in the past we focused more on that. In this last year we have focused more just on *learning* our own new technology, learning digital cameras, learning the *editing*, learning the new *keyboards*. We also put in SMART boards... Learning all the new technology takes a lot of time. Probably the emphasis is just learning the new technology we've just installed. We do have Finale installed- we have a *resource* center with Finale installed. Performer, Garage Band is also on the computers.

R: There are *too many* things you have to learn recently.

S: Very time consuming.

R: Technology goes so *fast*. You never can catch up.

S: We've really noticed it in the last few years. It has really *changed* very quickly.

R: So many things coming up day by day. I forgot to ask you earlier. Do you have any preferred *textbooks* that you use in your courses?

S: In our *ped* courses?

R: Yes.

S: (N.n) We *require* textbooks, but I don't *rely*- I *hardly* ever *use* them. I require them because I believe they're wonderful resources. Jeanine Jacobson just came out with a *new* textbook as well as Sylvia Coats. We've been using the *Uszler* both for the undergrad and grad courses Martha Baker Jordan also has a pedagogy textbook, the older Bastion, "How to Teach Piano" I *highly* recommend, particularly to undergraduate students. (.) There are wonderful teaching concepts in there. Jane Magrath's "Piano Lit book" is required. (.) I'll tell you, I require texts but I *rarely* use them much. I kind of just do my own *lectures*, projects, and so forth. (.) But I *require* it because I think students need to *own* the books as a resource.

R: Can you talk about the *financial* situation in your program? How are finances distributed in your program?

S: I have *no* idea. We don't really- I am *chair* of the keyboard area. The keyboard area does not have a *budget* as such. (.) If there's anything we *want*, we have to make a *request* to our director. (.) It took me five years to get new keyboard labs, because I had to continuously put through *proposals*. There wasn't a budget to manipulate. We do have a piano pedagogy- and this was established by (*person*) when he was here- a piano pedagogy *endowment*, and we can do some *purchasing* of materials with that money, some purchasing of equipment with that money. (.) A lot of our purchases, we're like the rest of the faculty, we go to the school of *music*- and, you know, (.) all of the *artists* that we bring in, we have to go make a *proposal* to the director. We don't really have a budget, *per se*.

R: Thank you. We have talked about the *status* of your program, now, I'd like your personal *opinion* about piano pedagogy professors. So, what kind- it seems that being a pedagogy instructor, you need to know *everything*.

S: So, is your question what are the characteristics of-

R: //Or what kind of *qualifications* you think best suit this position, because I think this is a... you are like an *expert* on everything.

S: [What are the *qualifications* for a pedagogy position?

R: Yes, what do you *think*?

S: Well, (.) actually, oddly- maybe, I think number one, a pedagogy instructor needs to be a really good *musician*. Even though I don't perform much anymore, I did do quite a bit of performing for a long time (.) I think being a really *good* musician still underpins being a really *good* teacher. You don't have to win *competitions* or anything, but you have got to be an *artistic* person, and really understand, that you *can't* teach *beyond* what you can really do yourself. (N.n) Most pedagogy people I know, at the same time, are very *broad-ranged* people. They have a lot of *interests*. They can do a number of *different* things, I think that's why they're *attracted* to the field, because it *allows* them to do more than *one thing*. So, I think it's requisite that a person be *broad-ranged*, have a lot of different *interests*. I don't think anybody would go into pedagogy without that. (N.n) Maybe pedagogues- it helps to be highly *organized*, to have very good *organization skills*. It helps to be very *people-oriented*, to like people, and enjoy working with people. Obviously it's vital to love working with children or adults. It's important to be really *passionate*, to really love teaching. A good *teacher* is always very interested in *developing* their own teaching. (.) If a professor is at that time developing their own teaching, I think they can be *helpful* to students who are developing their teaching. (.) It's very similar to developing your own piano playing, then you can *help* someone else develop their piano performing as well.

R: So do you have any preferred degree, like DMA, or Ph.D., or is it not a concern?

S: I *don't* think that makes any difference at all. I have a Ph.D., my colleague has a DMA. We have students getting *both* DMAs and Ph.D.s, and we have *really* good students getting both degrees, and I *don't* really think it makes that much difference. It really depends more on what the *person* felt like getting at that *particular* time in their life. I *don't* think it really matters.

R: So you don't think the *type* of degree is the issue, right?

S: No.

R: (.) Well, so we have gone through the curriculum, teacher training, technology, finances in your program. Which *one* do you think is the *largest* challenge you are facing in your program? Is there any?

S: List those again, between curriculum, finances, technology...

R: [And the instructors, or anything we haven't mentioned, talked about.

S: Biggest challenge...

R: If you had to come up with one challenge that you're dealing with now...

S: One challenge... I think we all wish we had more *time*.

R: That's very *true*.

S: *Biggest* challenge... you know, I would have said getting new *keyboard labs*... we've just spent... it was a huge, it took *forever* to get- we had 15-year-old labs, and were a big program, and for us to have 15-year-old labs that were very *outdated* was amazing. We practically had to- it took a *very* long time to get the new piano labs. That *was* a big challenge. I would say, one of our big challenges now, is we're working on trying to *replace* our piano inventory. That's maybe not *directly* related to the things you mention, but we're trying to get off a big *campaign* for that, and that's going to be another huge, *very long-range* challenge, to get the support, to get the donations to make that happen. That's going to be *ongoing*, it's going to be long term. I'd say that's a *big*, ongoing challenge *we've got*. Many of our pianos are wearing out.

R: So do you think that money is an issue more, or that technology is an issue more? (.) What affects this challenge?

S: (.) Technology is a *challenge* in that we, because of our new labs we have a *lot* of new technology to learn, but that's kind of an exciting thing. (.)It's exciting. I think the *finances* are more of a real obstacle.

R: Yeah, if you had more money you could do whatever-

S: //Yeah, if we had more money we could *replace* all of our pianos instantly.

R: Yes, definitely. So, if you had a *chance* to improve your obstacles, challenges *one* at a time, which one would you prefer to improve immediately?

S: If I could improve the finances, I'd *start* with that, because with better finances you can do a lot of things. You can do whatever you want. I'd *start* with that.

R: Ok. That's very important to *all* of the programs. Thank you. You have talked about the status and curriculum of your program. Now, my second *research* topic is to ask your personal opinion of the *ideal* piano pedagogy program. So, if you were going to build up your own ideal piano pedagogy program, what kind of picture would you *dream about* in your mind?

S: (.) I would actually probably keep a lot of the *same* elements that we already have. I actually think we have a lot of good things. I actually started a *masters* piano ped program where I was previously, and I had built into that a little more *structured* teaching. I think that would be the one thing I might change, is somehow build in a little more *structured* teaching for a *graduate* level program. (.) But to do that, we would need more instructors. (.) With the *number* of professors we have, we just can't do it. We can't do more than we're doing. We would need to *hire* more people, and then I think we could do that. That would be the first thing I think I would

change at the graduate level. (N.n) At the undergraduate level... again, I think to do any more... right now we rely on *doctoral* students, to help teach our *demo program*. (.) That always feels very *iffy*, because you don't know who's going to be here. *Again*, (.) Ideally, I think I would have more money and be able to hire someone more *full-time* to run a *continual* kind of demo lab program that we could dip into and draw upon for both the graduate and undergraduate courses. I would... maybe keep a lot of the same structure, (.) but increase it with more *supervised teaching* opportunities, which would take more faculty.

R: So, to make this come true in your dream, what would you see the *obstacle* to be?

S: *//Money*.

R: Money.

S: Yes, you need money to *hire* people. Really, that's the obstacle.

R: Is there any way you can improve- (.) find a possible *solution* for this financial issue?

S: (.) I don't know. I know we haven't gone there as a *faculty* to try to, just because there are so many- within the *whole* school of music there are so many *competing* demands. We have to be very *careful* what we ask for or demand, because it means we're not going to get other things. (.) We went through this big process of replacing two piano labs, and we are on a piano campaign. (.) Because those are two very large- both of those are *huge*, I mean the piano campaign is even larger, we will think carefully about asking for new faculty positions. You can *only* ask for so much, or you start *hurting* yourself. (.) You have to make your *choices* and decide which battles you'll *fight*, *what* the most important thing to keep *pushing* for. Recently equipment has been what we're in *dire need of*. If your *equipment* is falling apart you can't do anything.

R: Definitely, you have to set up your *priorities*.

S: That's right, you have to *prioritize* what you're going to ask for.

R: Well, my last question is: In your ideal program, would you offer a combined degree with piano performance and pedagogy, or would you offer a pedagogy degree which is *separated* from performance degree at the undergraduate and graduate levels?

S: (N.n) Doing *just* a *straight* pedagogy degree, or a combined performance/ped degree. In my *own* research, I found that there were very *few* straight pedagogy degrees. There were only *one* or *two* around the country, some of those had actually *converted*, or were in the *process* of converting to a combined degree. (.) I just felt that it was *not* a very popular degree. You didn't see many people *doing* it. The combined degree seemed to be the more *viable* recognizable degree, that people were more used to seeing (.) I clearly thought about it and I made a very *clear* choice. I felt a combined degree was much more *popular* and accessible and usable. I feel pretty *strongly* about it, because I had to make that choice at one point.

R: So you will offer this *combined* degree from the undergraduate all the way to the doctorate, *all the same*, right?

S: Well, I was thinking *primarily* about masters and doctoral programs. (.) For the undergrad degree, I think... I think I would keep what we've got, which is a *BM*. Our *BM* is a combined performance and pedagogy *degree*, and I would keep that. It's basically a performance plus ped degree. I believe *strongly* in that, rather than... I would *not* support an undergraduate straight pedagogy degree. People really need to build up their *playing skills at the undergrad level*.

R: Yes, I understand this point.

S: That's *really* important.

R: Thank you so much.

Interview with Subject Q

R: (Subject Q), thank you so much for your interview today. I'd like to let you know that your school's piano pedagogy program was selected as one of the top 20 by a group of people.

S: Who was the group of people?

R: Participants of the GP3, the Piano Pedagogy Conference, 2002. I invited those 51 participants, and they voted the top 20 they believed were the best in this country, and your school was one of those. (.) And I'd like to invite you to think about what kind of characteristics or strengths you think made this result.

S: I think several things. (.) One is the support of my colleagues, that there is a pedagogy program on campus, as well as a performance and music education program. Specifically, enhancements to the pedagogy program, such as the collegiate music teacher association that is affiliated with MTNA has been a nucleus for the program. Not only does it get the students involved professionally, but they also are mentored by the music teachers in the community, through the local association of MTNA. (N.n) They have been awarded chapter of the year twice. (.) They are very active in providing events for their students such as an elementary music festival that is open to the community, and a syllabus program called Music Progressions, that is a program of the (school) music teachers association. (.) As far as the program itself, there is a strong teaching component, so they are teaching right away from the first pedagogy class, and they teach at least two years if not three years. The requirement is four semesters for pedagogy majors, and one semester for performance majors, who often teach all four semesters. (.) Group teaching is a strong component. (.) A new part of the program is that students are building a portfolio to become certified through MTNA upon graduation, and this will continue to enhance the program.

R: It seems that your program has very strong relationships with music teacher associations.

S: (.) Yes it does.

R: How big is your program, how many graduate pedagogy students?

S: (.) It's a small program. We have an undergraduate degree in piano pedagogy, and a master's degree in piano pedagogy.

R: Do you have a doctoral degree in piano pedagogy?

S: No, (school) does not have any of the doctoral programs in any area of music, since the (another school) has them. We don't duplicate programs. (.) I would say at least 50% of the piano majors are pedagogy majors. Sometimes that goes to 60 percent or more, and sometimes it goes under 50 percent. It depends on the year. (.) Many of the undergraduate piano performance majors elect to go ahead and do the pedagogy component, too, which gives them a double major.

R: I see. So those pedagogy courses are required for the performance majors too, right?

S: One pedagogy course is required for the performance major.

R: Now could you talk about the curriculum content in your program, from the undergraduate level to the graduate level, please?

S: (.) Could you say more about that, what kind of things you're wanting?

R: Like major topics, major content, the specialty in your courses.

S: The important thing is that we are training teachers that will go out and teach students the ability to think musically and to solve problems. (.) We teach them how to conceptualize and diagnose musical problems and how to help their students solve those problems. (.) It is not a lecture approach, but an active participation approach. (.) Topics are the history of technique,

style periods, leveling of intermediate repertoire, knowing the various methods, method reviews, teaching music theory, functional skills of improvisation and so forth, educational theory, technology, lesson planning, and certainly more in depth group work, which is a strong feature of our program.

R: Do you have any preferred textbooks you use for your classes?

S: Well, at present it is called *Thinking as You Play*, by Sylvia Coats. In the past I have used the Marianne Uszler book, *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher*, the first edition and the second edition.

R: Yes, thank you. (.) How many courses are required for the undergraduate major, and also the graduate, masters degree?

S: Four courses are required for the undergraduate major and also a lecture in conjunction with a recital. The lecture on a pedagogy topic is at a different time, of course, from the recital. (.) Do you want to know what those courses are?

R: Yes, please.

S: (.) The first course is Piano Pedagogy, emphasizing the elementary level and also the philosophy of teaching. (.) The second course is Piano Teaching Materials, which emphasizes the intermediate student through the advanced student. The last two courses are both supervised teaching.

R: So, in your school, do you have a preparatory program? Does that associate with your program?

S: Yes it is does. (.) The students teach in that program to fulfill the requirements for their courses.

R: How big is that program?

S: The preparatory program includes orchestra and other instruments besides piano as well as dance, (.) So there is a range of different offerings. I would say the piano enrollment remains around 50. It is a small program.

R: But your students get experience through teaching there?

S: Exactly, that is how they get their experience, and many of them continue teaching even when they're not taking a pedagogy course. They continue teaching until they graduate.

R: I'm sorry, I didn't get how many courses are required for graduate students.

S: The two courses I just mentioned are preparatory courses for graduate credit. (.) In the actual program, there are three, a pedagogy seminar and two teaching practicums, called Group Piano Practicum and Studio Piano Practicum.

R: Earlier you mentioned how your students have to play recitals with pedagogical pieces, what do you mean by pedagogical pieces?

S: (.) What statement was that, just today, did I mention that today?

R: //Yes, you just mentioned earlier, your students have to play pedagogical pieces for their recital, am I right? Sorry.

S: [Oh, their lecture and their recital. I think you misunderstood. The requirement for the undergrad is a recital, a full recital, but they also prepare a 15 minute lecture on a pedagogical topic. (.) In the graduate program the student can elect to either play a 60-minute recital, along with a thirty-minute lecture on a pedagogical topic. However, they can elect not to play a recital, and instead prepare a three-hour workshop as their terminal requirement.

R: Thank you. It seems that in your program the teaching component is very strong. Could you talk about this more? I'd like to know more. (.) How do your students get those teaching experiences, through a one-on-one setting, or group teaching, could you talk about this?

S: (.) In the first pedagogy course, we teach a group of children together, while the entire class observes. I teach the first lesson, and then the students team teach at least two classes together. (.) Then the next team will teach the following two, and so we cycle through until everyone gets group experience during the semester. They also are required to teach two individual students during the semester. Many times the students are from the group lesson, since these students have a group lesson once a week and an individual lesson once a week. (.) Others are assigned students that take an individual lesson once a week. In the second semester of pedagogy we don't continue the observation of the group lesson, but they continue teaching at least two students through the semester. (.) In the two courses in supervised teaching, students may elect to teach a group and another lesson of an individual student, or they may teach two individual students. They develop the curriculum for the semester, write lesson plans every week, videotape, and meet with me every week. (.) I observe all of their lessons, and we talk about their teaching. (N.n) At the graduate level, they start out the same way, then in their group teaching practicum they teach a music major skills class of 12 people, (.) and they also teach a small group of children. Often the children's group meets in an elementary school that's an arts magnet close to the university. (.) In the studio piano practicum, they are asked to teach three different students on three different levels--beginning, intermediate, and advanced students. They prepare the curriculum, write a beginning and ending paper, prepare lesson plans, video tape lessons, and meet with me weekly. (N.n) This year, for the first time, students are preparing a portfolio, required for MTNA Professional Certification. Their lesson plans are designed for inclusion in the portfolio. They have written papers on their teaching objectives for a student for the semester, how they will facilitate those objectives, and how they will assess their student's progress.

R: It's a very strong teaching component, very diverse. So your students, undergraduate and graduate students, all get teaching experience in one-on-one and group teaching.

S: [Although students observe lessons, I think our program is different (.) in that I allow them to have primary responsibility for the students right away with my supervision.

R: So the students they teach are from the preparatory department, right?

S: Yes. However, if they are from the area and already have teaching studios, they may use their own students. (.) Occasionally one of the teachers in the community will hire a student teacher.

R: That's very nice. Now I have to ask you your personal opinion, if you were going to hire a piano pedagogy instructor, what kind of background or what kind of degree do you think is best for this position?

S: (N.n) Certainly the candidate should have a pedagogy degree if they're going to be teaching pedagogy courses. Is that what you're asking?

R: Because everyone has different opinions.

S: (.) I think they need to play as well as possible. I want my graduates playing as well as possible. (.) An important part of the interview would be to demonstrate their musicianship through performance, (.) Part of the interview would be observing their teaching in different settings—an advanced student, a group lesson for children and group piano for music majors, and a pedagogy class.

R: Would you consider that a Ph.D. degree or a DMA degree would make a difference, or is that not the issue?

S: (N.n) No, I don't think the type of degree is the issue for me. I think it would be based on that person's skills and the resume. (.) I would look just as strongly at a Ph.D. as a DMA.

R: Thank you. Earlier you talked about technology, I'd like to know how is technology used in

your program?

S: (.) The undergraduates have a piano skills class, including the piano majors. Part of the group piano curriculum is utilizing technology. (.) Students prepare five or six sequencing projects to learn about digital technology in our piano lab. (.) In the pedagogy course, students sequence an accompaniment with multiple voices and drum tracks for one of their students. They also have internet projects to explore websites for helpful resources. In their terminal lectures, most all students are using PowerPoint presentations along with video and other technology resources.

(N.n)

R: (.) And is that the same as the graduate students?

S: Yes. In addition graduate teaching assistants, who teach group piano, and others enrolled in Group Piano Practicum learn to operate a piano lab and the lesson controller. They are trained in using a software program in order to teach group piano students how to sequence.

R: So actually those technologies are part of the process in your class, right?

S: Yes.

R: Great. By the way, do you have any favorite software you use?

S: (.) We have Macintosh computers, so we're using the Performer sequencing software, and that's the primary technology that we teach.

R: Thank you so much. Now let's talk about finance. How are the finances in your program?

S: Not very good.

R: Everybody says this!

S: (.) There is not really a separate piano or piano pedagogy budget. Each area of the music program vies for the same scholarship money. (N.n) Maintenance and care of instruments and purchase of new instruments and a piano lab are problems.

R: Does the preparatory program help you to generate money?

S: (.) No, the preparatory program only pays for itself. The income from the students goes to pay the teachers, the director, and marketing.

R: Doesn't really help too much. OK, thank you. (.) We talked about curriculum, finance, technology, and instructors in your program, which one do you think is the biggest challenge you are facing right now?

S: Well, it's really tied to budget. (.) Our state seems to continually cut. Even when we have higher enrollment, it doesn't seem to matter. Travel funds for faculty have been cut pretty severely. (.) Students have been attending state and national conferences for many years, and the university is supportive of them. Last year, however, there was no support, so I'm afraid that's the wave of the future. (.) I'm concerned about our facilities, the aging building. It was built in the fifties and needs renovation, and we're outgrowing it. Lack of high tech classrooms is another problem. I'm involved in video conferencing, and we can't do it from our building, we have to go elsewhere. We have a technology cart, that only a few teachers use, and you have to haul it to class. (.) Another issue along with aging pianos is an aging piano lab. The piano lab is probably my biggest concern right now, because it's about 15 years old.

R: Ah, you need to replace. (.) And if you can only improve one challenge at a time, which one would you chose to improve immediately, right away?

S: The piano lab. (.) We need it functional, because every music major uses it, and they need up-to-date equipment to prepare them for their careers, as well as to prepare them to play the piano.

R: That's very practical, thank you. OK, now I'd like to go on to my second research question, which is your vision of an idealized piano pedagogy program. If you were going to build up

your own ideal piano pedagogy program, what kind of picture would you see as what you would like to happen?

S: (.) I would envision graduates from all pedagogy programs meeting curriculum standards for each level of degree, undergraduate, masters and doctoral, such as the pedagogy curriculum articulated by the National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy. (N.n) Each student would be capable of demonstrating the knowledge and skills of that curriculum. I envision each graduate becoming a Nationally Certified Teacher of Music through the MTNA Professional Certification program. I think that will more readily prepare students for their teaching future than just the pedagogy component of a class. (.) I think they need to experience professionalism (.) while they're in college so that when they do graduate they are contributing to the profession, are very involved professionally, (.) and are providing the best possible studio for their students. (N.n) One thing I should mention, I think programs have to be eclectic. In other words, I'd like to see many different needs of teachers met. I think we need to do a better job of meeting the needs of the teachers that don't have degrees, and that may not end up getting a degree, but nevertheless need training.

R: Very important and very practical, to those piano teachers. (N.n) What kind of obstacles do you see if you want to build up this ideal program?

S: (N.n) Probably finances again.

R: Why?

S: (.) As far as certification is concerned, the fee is fairly steep for a college student. However it is no more than a semester hour would be, so that may not be so much of an issue. I'm talking about this so much because I'm very involved in the MTNA National Certification Commission. (N.n) I think certification could readily be accomplished within the existing structures. On the issue of addressing teachers' needs, that's going to require more faculty, and it would be difficult to hire more faculty at a good wage. Adjunct faculty are not usually paid well, so that would be the big issue.

R: So you think finances and faculty, (.) and actually faculty is something to do with finance, right? So any possible solutions for this, finance, to help your dream come true?

S: (N.n) I would like to see a program of donations and awards that would encourage certification and would help students through the process by paying their membership dues and certification fees. (.) Combining courses could serve graduate, undergraduate, and community people as well. (.) Therefore additional instructors would not need to be hired. As far as making the dream come true, I think following the MTNA Professional Certification standards as a pedagogy professor will certainly help keep my focus on issues important to teachers' futures.

R: Thank you so much. My last question, this question comes from research results, some research suggests that piano pedagogy should separate from performance, separate degrees, and some research suggests they should combine as one degree. In your ideal program, in your vision, what kind of degree would you think would be the best?

S (.) I can't be so bold as to say that everybody should be a pedagogy major, because for some students, performance is really what they want to do. Being a pedagogy major is time consuming with teaching and observing lessons, which takes away from practice time, so it's difficult for students to combine pedagogy and performance. (.) But realistically, I think every piano major will teach. (.) It really bothers me that they have none to only one pedagogy course in some degree plans. And so I would lean towards combining the performance and pedagogy degree, because I think graduates will most likely be teaching. (.) Here a pedagogy degree does not add that many more courses, but it's still too many overall. It's difficult to find courses to cut when

you start combining degrees.

R: So you think that combined degrees should be offered from the undergraduate all the way to the doctoral degree?

S: (.) I can't speak about the doctoral degree because we do not offer a doctorate. My DMA was a good combination of performance pedagogy, and it was a wonderful program. (.)

R: But you think it would be good for bachelors and masters?

S: Yes.

R: Thank you so much.

Interview with Subject R

R: Thank you, (Subject R), for your interview today. I'd like to let you know, *congratulations*, (school's) piano pedagogy program was selected as one of the *top 20* piano pedagogy programs by a *group* of people. Now I'd like you to think about what kind of *characteristics* made people select your program.

S: Well, I have been thinking about *that*, and to be very *honest*, I can only go by whom I voted for, and I *found* that I didn't really vote for the *program* as much as I voted for the people who ran the program, for their *professional* standing. The person running it, what they've published, what I've seen them do in *workshops*, what I've seen them do at *conferences* – that's what got my vote.

R: I see, so you think that *people* are mainly the factor that influenced the results?

S: Yes.

R: How big is your program?

S: It's very *small*. It is undergraduate *only*, this is an undergraduate conservatory, there are no graduate schools here, except for some graduate programs in the summer, but not in pedagogy. I offer the classes every *other* year, and each time I offer them, I usually have seven or eight in a class.

R: So do you have a *degree* in piano pedagogy?

S: Yes, it's a Bachelor of Music in *Keyboard Pedagogy*, and within that, then, is organ pedagogy, piano pedagogy, and church music.

R: I see. Is it more like a *teaching* institution?

S: No, a *conservatory*, but this degree exists as a separate degree.

R: Now can you talk about the *curriculum content* that you offer?

S: I don't know how much you want to know. I can tell you the things that are listed in the *syllabus*. Is that what you're interested in?

R: I'd like to know how many courses are *required*, and then deeper than that, what kind of *topic* content you would offer, you would discuss in your classes.

S: It's a *one* year course of three credit hours each semester, and along with the in-class work, there is also a *student teaching* experience, that is two credit hours a semester for two years. In the student teaching experience, we get together once a week and plan a group lesson, and then the children who are *assigned* to study with the student teachers *all meet* on Monday afternoon and we have a group lesson. The teachers *divide* up the content and *teach*, while I observe and evaluate. They also have a 30 minute *private* lesson with the student each week. The students *videotape* a number of those lessons, I review them, and then the student and I get together to evaluate, make suggestions and discuss what was on the tape.

R: Is the student teaching not included in the courses?

S: No, the course is *one* thing, the student teaching is the another. Ideally we *try* to have them do it in the same year, so that it's all going continuously together. In the *second* year, they're done with the coursework, and I decide, based on their first year of student teaching, if they are doing the *second* year of student teaching, *again* under my supervision for credit, or whether I feel that they're ready to continue with me just as a consultant, and then they do it for *zero* credit and the Community Music School *pays* them to continue the student teaching. Usually with those students, they teach as long as they're here, so that they always have a minimum of *two* years of student teaching.

R: I see, so do the pedagogy students *teach* Community Music School's students?

S: The program is called *Beginning Piano for Children*. It is a separate program *through* the Community Music School, and it's for children who are *absolute* beginners who are entering second or third grade.

R: So your pedagogy students teach them for private lessons and also group class?

S: *Yes*.

R: So do they have a chance to teach an *adult class* or *college class*?

S: No, later on, within the pedagogy class, they are *required* to observe class piano classes in the conservatory. I haven't included that in the student teaching curriculum, but they do have to observe *private* music teachers within the Community Music School for part of the requirement of their student teaching.

R: Now I'd like to go back to your core course for a second. Do you have a major *philosophy* that you stand for in your class?

S: I guess my basic philosophy that I try and get *across* is that they should always have demonstration and experience first - they should have the children listening and experiencing *before* they see the stuff on the page, and that they should talk as *little* as possible. I'm not saying that I'm terribly successful in that, but that's what I try to get them to do. Sometimes you see them student teaching and you wonder, "Where *were* they when we talked about this?" But that's *really* what student teaching is for.

R: Yes, and what kind of *topics* do you talk about?

S: We start out talking about *various* approaches to learning theories - the kind of classifications that Keith Golay talks about, and Earl Oremus, who talks about intuitive and non-intuitive learners. We also talk about their *modes* of learning - visual, aural, tactile, etc. We spend some time *figuring* out what to look for when you evaluate a method book, they have to construct an evaluation *form* to use, and we discuss what's important in a method book. What are you *looking for* when you evaluate a new book? The next step is for them to evaluate a method series and its *supplementary* materials. We discuss teaching technique, sight reading, memorization, phrasing, pedaling, and effective practice techniques. I have them view the *videotape* by Barbara Lister-Sink, *Freeing the Caged Bird*, and then of course we have (person) on our faculty here, so we talk about his book. One of my other big philosophies is that the *main* goal of every piano lesson is to prepare for *practice*, and so we go through *how* you prepare for practice. We do *peer teaching* in the class. (I am sometimes a *very*, *very* slow student for them. I can't seem to get *anything* right!) That way they have a little hands-on work in class along with their student teaching. We do a fairly in-depth study on *healthy* piano technique and practice techniques within the area of *wellness*. We talk about various approaches for teaching the *very young* student. We talk about Suzuki. We talk about MusikGarten, Kindermusic and various commercial methods for very young children. In our student teaching for the group lesson, we use *MusicMakers at the Keyboard*, which is published by MusikGarten, as a basic method to work from for the group lesson. It has a *lot* of *songs* and dances and movement. We use the *group* lesson as an *enhancement* time, when we learn songs. In this MusikGarten method, you learn to *sing* a song, then sometimes you *move* to it. You learn the *solfege syllables* for it, and then you play it by ear on the keyboard to the solfege syllables. It's a *very* lovely little sequence of going from singing to the *piano*, developing the *ear*, developing the *solfege*. It's really a nice *packet* - we don't use it completely, we *bring* other stuff in, but it's a nice basis. The children also play for each other, whatever pieces they're doing that they have ready to play. So that's first semester.

Second semester, we spend some time talking about *how* to teach the adult, *adult learning theories* and *methods* that are available. We discuss the challenges of the *transfer* student, and I have them develop their own *diagnostic tool* for testing where a transfer student is at in *rhythm, reading* and *theory*. This is a diagnostic instrument that they *make*, they turn in, and then they *have* it for when they're teaching, to use on their transfer students. We study *intermediate repertoire*, particularly in reference to appropriate *sequencing*. At this point in the student's progress they're no longer going page by page in a method book, and so it is important for the pedagogy student to be adept at sequencing the materials. We also discuss teaching sight reading, memorization techniques, pedaling and stylistic issues of intermediate literature, and do an *evaluation* of anthologies and editions. We discuss how to teach *jazz*, and how to teach *12-bar blues* and *lead lines*. We discuss the *use* of group teaching in the private studio, and that's where they do some *observing* of group teaching in some independent teachers' studios and they observe the collegiate level class piano. We spend some time on *preparing* for the business of teaching - writing cover letters and resumes, constructing studio policies and billing procedures. We also discuss *zoning issues*. We explore the use of technology in the lesson. They've been *experiencing* technology in the group lessons all along – it takes place in our collegiate class piano lab, and they are using *MIDI disks* to teach. They are also using the master console to listen in on individual students, and all the *stuff* that you do in a lab. I *require* them to *compile* a list of websites that are dedicated to pedagogy. I also have a series of videos by *Maurice Hinson* – the Classical Era, the Romantic Era, etc., and they have to watch and turn in a summary of those.

R: Thank you. In two semesters! A *lot* of work.

S: And especially for an undergraduate course. Pretty demanding.

R: Do you have any *preferred* textbook for your class?

S: I use a bunch of them actually. First semester I mainly use *Well Tempered* by Uszler. I also have them get *Creative Piano Teaching*, by Lyke, and that little booklet by Marianne Uszler called "That's a Good Question" published by FJH Music. Second semester, we continue to use information from those, but second semester I have them get *Intermediate Piano Repertoire* by Albergo and Alexander just so they'll have it in their library as a *reference*. I have them get *Practical Piano Pedagogy* by Martha Baker-Jordan, so they have all the forms on the CD - there's a *lot* of studio forms and stuff that I think they could use. And then I have them get another booklet by Marianne Uszler, *Time Flies: How to Make the Best Use of Teaching Time*. And then I *recommend*, but I do not *require*, the book on *ornamentation: A Question and Answer Manual* by Valerie Lloyd Watts. I *put* on reserve in the library the *Symposium for Pianists and Teachers* and they have several assigned readings from it. I think the *very, most* important book, when we're talking *technique*, and that I use as a reference is *What Every Pianist Should Know About the Body*, by Thomas Mark. It is really *excellent*. So anyway, those are pretty much the things that I ask them to get.

R: So, are you the only one pedagogy faculty there at your school?

S: Yes, I am.

R: So in your opinion, what do you think is the best kind of qualification for this position?

S: I think that the *most* important qualification that there is for a pedagogy teacher is to have taught *hundreds* of children, to have had a *lot* of experience as an *independent* music teacher. Back in 1994, I presented a paper at the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy called "Wanted: Pedagogues with Dirty Hands." I felt such a concern about students who were doing their bachelors, masters, doctorate and going straight into a university teaching pedagogy *without*

much teaching experience, because it was all theory and they'd never really taught a *lot* of children. And so I think it's wonderful to have a Ph.D. or a DMA in pedagogy. I think that's certainly necessary, but I think *even more* important is that they've taught a *lot* of children and a *lot* of transfer students, and a *lot* of adults.

R: So do you think the degree, the title *affects* qualification?

S: It did not in my case. I would have to say that almost everything I know about *really* teaching, and teaching pedagogy, I have learned from *workshops* and *conferences* and *experience*, *but*, I have to put a *caveat* there, I did *not* attend a very strong program. My doctorate was done at a school that, at that time, did not have a very strong doctoral program.

R: You are very *humble*. Thank you. Let's shift a little bit to *technology*. You mentioned technology a little while earlier, so besides this, would you like to mention any specifics you *use* in your program?

S: Well, it's pretty *low-tech* stuff actually, I wouldn't call myself a big *techie*. In the group lessons, when the kids come into the lab, while we're waiting for everybody to gather, and for the first few minutes of the group lesson, they *do* some computer games, you know, they do Midiasaurus, and they do Maestro, MusicAce, something like that. They play those, and then of course we have the MIDI Disks that go with the series that we use. As I mentioned before, I have them do the web search for what's on there. *However*, I would have to say, and this is kind of *anti-technology*, I require them to do a *paper* each semester, and since it's undergraduate, it's just five to eight pages. I have had to put in the *syllabus* that I *want* them to access, I want them to know how to use, the *Music Index*, which most of them don't even know. I have occasionally gotten papers that were *totally* based on stuff they found when they *Googled* the subject of the paper, and I have had to make some restrictions that I want at least *three* sources in the paper to have come from a *real book*, or a *real journal*, or a *real magazine*. It could be an *online journal*, but *not* just "I'm a teacher and this is what I think" sites on the web. So I think, as the web becomes more *prevalent* as a search engine, I'm starting to make more *restrictions* on what they can cite in a paper. I guess that's sort of anti-technology. Anyway, that's basically what I do.

R: OK, thank you. Now could you talk about the *finances* in your program?

S: Well, yes and no. In the *group* teaching part, the children's parents are *paying* tuition into the community music school, and as the community music school *director*, I am not paying the teachers anything, because they are *student teachers*, so the money that comes in as *tuition* is used to *buy* the MukicGarten materials. The student teachers do not have to purchase those, they are given to them. So that covers that end, and it also leaves *enough over* that I've bought some drums and some rhythm instruments, and various things for movement classes. For the pedagogy class itself, I really *don't* spend much, the kids have to buy their books, we have an entire pedagogy *library* with desk copies of all the latest methods books in it. Really the only *cost* that I have to the department, to the conservatory, is a *work study student* who enters all the stuff that's going into the library into a database and then *files* it. So that is really the only *cost* that the conservatory has from the pedagogy program.

R: So mainly your money is *generated* from the community school?

S: Yes.

R: Ok, now we've talked about curriculum, finances, technology, everything in your program. Maybe more than that, what do you see as the largest *challenge* that you are facing now?

S: There are several levels of challenges. There's the challenge of finding the *right* children to participate in the keyboard for children program. Although it's a large community music school, we have about 900 students that come, you need someone who has *not* had any piano lessons,

and who is going into second or third grade. So that's always a challenge to *find* those students, and to try to get a *commitment* from the parents that they will stay at least a year. Another challenge is to discuss the topics that you want to cover, and still have time for in-class peer teaching. *Because* of that, I assign a lot of reading that I never discuss in class. I *really* ask them to operate at more of a graduate level. So anyway, that's always kind of a challenge also. And probably the *last* challenge is that I wish I had the *time* to sit and *personally* watch these private lessons instead of having them videotaped, but I would be here from dawn 'til midnight, because they're taught through the evenings. This curriculum already puts me on an overload because I'm half-time faculty and half-time administrative, and you just can't *generate* enough load credits to cover the time you're actually putting in.

R: So you've talked about those challenges, if you could only improve one at a time, which one would you chose to improve *immediately*?

S: I would *attend* all of the private lessons that my students taught. That would be it. Or at least, I would attend a *huge* portion of them for more evaluation *and* for more modeling. Occasionally I have had teachers, I can see from the tapes I'm getting and from talking with them, that they're just not getting it with a student, they're trying to do something and it's not working. I will, then, go and sit in on the lesson and teach the lesson. I had this one teacher who was kind of shy and not very aggressive, and she had a little girl who was *really* aggressive and wanted to *run* the lesson. It was the only time I've ever seen this: the little girl didn't want anything written on the page of music, she couldn't *stand* to have anything written on the page, and so in this one tape, the teacher reaches over and writes something on the music and the little girl picks up the pencil and *erases* it, and the teacher didn't say anything. And that's when I thought, OK, I'm teaching that lesson next week. Stuff got written all over the page, and the little girl came to understand that we could have a *wonderful* time and still have the teacher in *charge*.

R: It *takes* experience.

S: It does. It takes experience and a lot of *confidence*. And so, anyway, things like that, if I could just be there in the lesson more often, if I had the *time*, I would do that.

R: Now, let's go to my second research question, your ideal pedagogy program. If you were going to build up your own ideal pedagogy program, what kind of a picture would you *dream* about?

S: Well, I think pretty much what we just discussed. The *time*. The time to talk about everything in *class* that needs to be talked about, and *still* have time for peer teaching in class. I would *love* to, in an ideal world, get a *home-schooled* student who wants to take a weekly lesson, and have them come in *every* week during class, teach them in front of the class, and have the class teach them. They would be sort of the *guinea pig*, to be there through every phase of the book. That would just be *so* lovely, but of course it's not going to happen. In this way the students could have so much more *exposure* to *hands on* teaching, in front of each other, *with* me being the student, with *them* being the student, but *also* with a *real* student being the student. That would be really *ideal*. But we'd have to meet for two hours a day, five days a week. Maybe a little tiresome.

R: So do you see any possible *obstacles* if you want this to come true?

S: (laugh) Well it would have to be a 10 credit hour course, which isn't going to happen, and I'd have to get about 15 hours of load credit for it, which isn't going to happen, so yes, it's the *impossible* dream, *but* when you throw in an impossible dream, you sometimes figure out how to make little *bits* of it come true.

R: Any possible *solutions* to get your dream closer?

S: Well, I *could* have them read *everything*, and spend the entire class each time doing teaching, but I don't think that's a good thing either, so *no*, I really haven't figured out anything yet, sorry. Maybe your dissertation will come up with lots of ideas and it will tell me how to do this.

R: Oh, I hope so, that's my purpose. OK, my last question is, I know that your school only offers the bachelors degree in pedagogy. Some research suggests that piano pedagogy should combine with the piano performance degree as one degree. Some research suggests that you have a *separate* degree. In your *ideal* program, what kind of degree would you offer?

S: At the undergraduate or the graduate?

R: *Both*.

S: Well, the undergraduate program that we have, they *still* have to perform. They have to do a senior recital. They have to take lessons and progress through juried levels. They have to do technique juries. They have to do piano juries, the whole nine yards. So really performance is an *integral* part of the degree. And it's a bachelors of music, which is more of a performance degree in keyboard pedagogy. At the graduate level, I think certainly at the masters level, it should be *both*. The reason being that I think they say if you can't perform you *should* teach, and I don't agree with that, I think that you are a much better teacher if you are *performing* yourself – if you're having to approach and solve your own musical and technical problems. And the other reason, *conversely*, not only do I think it makes you a better teacher, I think it makes you a better *pianist*. I know after I finished my masters degree I was out teaching independently for a while before I started my doctorate. I was doing some performing and some solos and recitals just on my own, and I *suddenly* took responsibility for my own playing – I became my own teacher for the first time. My playing improved tremendously, and I think my teaching did too. So I think they're really *integral*. At the doctorate level, I'm *not* sure if a DMA is appropriate or not, because I think it calls for a level of *commitment* and a level of playing that is *not* always done by the kind of person who is going to be *interested* in teaching *average beginners*. As director of the community music school, I have *hired* several young teachers who want to teach in the community music school and are finishing a DMA. I find that their *focus* and their understanding of *why* a child is taking lessons, the average child, becomes a little *skewed*. I think that the doctorate of pedagogy should be given over *almost* entirely in how to train *teachers*. At the bachelors level we learn how to teach little kids and beginners. At the masters level we learn how to teach beginning, intermediate and advanced. But at the *doctoral* we *should* be teaching how to teach the bachelors and the masters students, and I'm not sure all of the programs are *doing* that yet. But to me, one of the problems at the university, and this is in *every* area, is that the professors are *extremely* good at what they *do* (such as performing), but don't know how to *teach*. That shouldn't be the problem in pedagogy because a pedagogy professor should know how to *teach*, for goodness sake, but they may not know how to *train* teachers.

R: So you think at the bachelors and masters level you would prefer more of a combined, and up to the doctoral level you would think more pedagogy sided?

S: Well, I think at the doctoral level they should still be *playing* and taking lessons. I think performance should still be *required*, but I don't think it should have the *emphasis* that a DMA has. If it's a blend, it would certainly have to be a very *pedagogy-heavy blend*. I think it's important that they still *play*, and they still *learn*, but I think there's other things that are also very important at that level.

R: So do you think that a Ph.D. would suit this purpose better?

S: I don't know. It depends on the Ph.D. I hold a Ph.D. in music education *specializing* in piano pedagogy because that's all the university I attended offered. So just the *name* of the degree doesn't make nearly as much difference as the *quality* of the program. And that boils down to *who's* running it, which takes us *full* circle.

R: A lot of people told me the same thing, that they voted for people because they don't know the program so much.

S: Yes, the people.

R: Thank you so much for your interview today. It was very nice to talk to you.

S: You are welcome.

Interview with Subject S

R: (Subject S), thank you for your interview today, I'd like to let you know that (your school's) piano pedagogy program was selected as one of the top 20 piano pedagogy programs by a group of *people*. Now I'd like to ask you, can you think about what kind of *characteristics* made people choose your school for the top 20?

S: I think really there are *four* things that I can think of. First of all, I think we offer a *comprehensive* curriculum that's appealing to students. Our curriculum covers the foundations of principles of piano teaching, and we *really* give students an opportunity to explore *independently*, topics of *special* interest. So first thing is a comprehensive curriculum. The second thing, I think, is we have a dedicated and *knowledgeable* faculty. Our faculty in the keyboard area works very much together to *foster* creativity and research in our students, and just really to *mentor* our students, and because of that we have a small program size, which again fosters that student-faculty *interaction* and *mentoring*. Also, the last thing would be we have students who are very *eager* to learn. We have very zealous students and all those things work together I think, to make our program one that, perhaps, stands out above others.

R: That's nice. So how *big* is your piano pedagogy program?

S: In terms of students, it *ranges*, usually we have 20 students and above. We try to keep the number *small*, again to foster that student-faculty *interaction* and *mentoring*.

R: You mean 20 students majoring in piano pedagogy, or pianists?

S: *Pianists*, exactly.

R: So do you offer a pedagogy degree for different levels, like undergraduate, masters, doctoral?

S: We do not offer a doctoral degree, we *only* have bachelors and masters degrees, and we offer piano pedagogy *emphasis* for the *masters* degree.

R: I see. It's total around 20 students?

S: Right, and again that's sort of a number off the top of my head, it depends, *year by year*. Again, we try to keep the numbers *low* enough to keep the size small in order to foster mentoring.

R: (.) Now can you talk about the curriculum content you offer?

S: Because our program is quite *small* in terms of numbers, our undergraduate and graduate students enroll in the *same* pedagogy courses, with graduate students completing *additional* work and projects. The undergraduate students complete more basic requirements, with more extensive requirements given to the grad students. (.) We offer three *10-week* quarters of piano pedagogy, and one 10-week course in group piano pedagogy *specifically*. And as I mentioned earlier, our curriculum covers the *fundamentals* of piano teaching from basic methods and materials to business aspects of the independent studio. (.) We also explore *educational theories* and philosophies, so really, our curriculum is quite comprehensive I think. And as I mentioned earlier, I think a very nice thing about our program is that we allow our students to *enroll* in independent research practica, which gives them *the opportunity* to research topics that are of interest to them.

R: I see, so that's also for *undergraduate* and graduate students, both?

S: Exactly.

R: You offer three courses, and then one is *specially* for group piano?

S: Exactly.

R: Ok, are they all *required*?

S: We *strongly* encourage our students, *especially* for the piano pedagogy emphasis, the graduate students, they are required. But for the piano performance majors we do *strongly encourage* them, and most of them do take the pedagogy courses. Most, if not all.

R: Excellent. Now I'd like to focus on *teaching experience* a little bit more. Can you talk about how your students get that teacher training and teaching experience? (.) Through the courses or do they have an extra curriculum to *practice* their teaching skills?

S: Our students have chances to enroll in *practicum* where they teach both children through adults, not only in applied one-on-one settings, but also in *group* settings. And the way that we facilitate this is through our *community music school*. (The school) serves as our *laboratory*, teaching both children through adults. We also offer a *children's* program, what we call a piano preparatory program, which is a very strategically-*designed* curriculum which begins with *both* a group and applied private lesson for children, and this is directed by (person), who teaches those courses, and we also work *directly* with the piano pedagogy faculty on that.

R: I see, so you mean your pedagogy students teach at the preparatory program and also the community music?

S: //Exactly, that's *part* of their piano pedagogy coursework. They're required to teach children. Many of the grad students, of course, teach *adults* as well, so they're experiencing teaching at all different levels and age groups.

R: So both graduates and undergraduates *all* teach in those settings?

S: Exactly, we do approach that on both levels. (.) And another aspect that we consider important in terms of teacher *training and experience* is the opportunity for the students to be active in *MTNA*, (Association). We do have a forthcoming collegiate MTNA chapter opening at our campus as well.

R: (.) So besides the three courses you mention, you also have *practicum* especially for teacher training, right?

S: Exactly. Again those are *independent* practicum. They also are *required* to teach as *part* of their piano pedagogy courses. They're getting *experience* and observation, supervision, in both pedagogy courses as *well* as through independent practicum.

R: So how many practicum do they have to take?

S: Again, the practicum, I believe those are just at the student's *discretion*, and the faculty, we kind of encourage student enrollment depending on the *needs* of the student. I must say at the very outset here, as well, I'm *new* to the program, so I'm still trying to learn the requirements.

R: So in those courses, could you talk about how *technology* is used in your program?

S: Sure. I must say at the very beginning, technology is an *integral* part of our coursework. With that said, we train our students that technology must be used to *enhance* the curriculum and must not be used to *guide* the curriculum. (.) And what I mean by that is that oftentimes, technology, just because it's new and it's fresh, we feel that we must, we're *obligated* to use it. But we try to communicate to our students that technology must be used to *enhance* the curriculum and if it's not serving that purpose, the goals of our teaching, then *perhaps* it should not be used. But again, it's really important and we do *incorporate* that in our teaching and the coursework for our students. Also, we have a very nice relationship with a *local retailer* in town who brings the *latest* equipment and technologies to campus, to our school of music building, giving our students the *chance to experience* these technologies in action. So whatever technology, perhaps, we are not able to purchase at that time, the retailer brings to campus and gives our students that opportunity. (N.n) Also in terms of technology, the students are involved in a *variety* of different projects as part of their piano pedagogy coursework, in both piano

pedagogy and group piano pedagogy. There are technology *components* of those courses, and then of course our graduate students are *actively* involved in the technologies related to class piano teaching and the group piano teaching labs.

R: So could you talk about what kind of facilities you mainly ask students to *utilize* in your courses?

S: We have two group piano *laboratories*, one is a Yamaha lab, the other is a Technics lab. Both labs are *equipped* with computer stations at each digital piano. One lab, the Yamaha lab, has Mac G5 computers, and the other has Dell PC systems at each keyboard. (.) We do use *Home Concert* technology quite frequently. We have recently used Alfred's Interactive Musician to supplement our *sight reading* material, (.) as well as a variety of other materials, such as Band in a Box, etc.

R: Ok. Is there any particular *software* you use, or does it depend on the situation?

S: It really *depends* on the course that we're teaching. Like I said, Home Concert has been very popular with our students and teachers, as well as Alfred's Interactive Musician, which is a new piece of software that we've been experimenting with.

R: Let me go back to the curriculum a little bit. Do you have any particular textbooks you use?

S: Yes we use Marianne Uszler's *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher*, among other texts. (.) For my group piano pedagogy course that I teach, I use materials that I have published myself, personally.

R: That's nice! (.) Ok, now I would like to know about your personal opinion of being a piano pedagogy professor. What do you think is the *best* qualification or *degree* that will fit this position?

S: (N.n) That's a very good question. First of all, I think that a piano pedagogy professor, first and foremost, should be a *competent* musician, and a *performer*, and I think there's this stigma that if you're a pedagogy teacher, that you're not a competent musician, and I really think that's a *false* statement, because I think as pedagogy teachers, we're not only teaching performance. Many pedagogy teachers are also teaching *applied piano*, but we're also teaching *class piano*, and those basic *musicianship* skills, such as transposition and harmonization and those sorts of things, which are *essential* skills, and all musicians should possess them. I think, additionally, there should be a solid knowledge of the subject matter, *obviously*, (.) the ability to really structure and present the subject in a very clear and understandable manner. I think *strong* pedagogy teachers are always prepared, and they're imaginative in their planning and their teaching. (N.n) Another important aspect, is an observant, a perceptive quality. (.) Pedagogy teachers must observe their student teachers frequently and be able to provide *feedback*. They must be able to assess the problems and provide *solutions* to those problems on very short notice. So being able to *diagnose* problems and then constructing solutions. I think pedagogy teachers must also be *motivational*, *inspirational*, must be excited about teaching people of all ages, children to adults and be able to relate that to their students, so in that regard they must be *personable* and *relational*.

R: Yes, and do you think any *degree* is the best?

S: You know, I think the *more coursework* one has under their belt, and the more training one has, I think that prepares that person, *perhaps*, more to be more *successful* in the field. And so, of course a DMA or a Ph.D. are both *desirable* degrees, but I think there are outstanding teachers out there who have a masters degree who are outstanding pedagogy instructors as well.

R: I see. So how are *finances* in your program?

S: That's always the issue, I think. (.) I think that's the *largest* challenge that we're facing right now -- funding. Like most universities, I think the arts *especially* are feeling financial strains because of poor state economies. We're *constantly* seeking external and internal funding resources. (N.n) In an ideal situation we would have an *endless* budget to work with, but as you know that's impossible.

R: So we have talked about curriculum, technology, and structure, or maybe then you have just mentioned, which one do you think is the *largest* challenge you are facing in your program?

S: Well I think really, as I mentioned earlier, it's *funding*, and finding those resources in terms of financial abilities to purchase new equipment and the latest in technology and offer competitive scholarships and those sorts of things. (.) We have been hit particularly *hard* with the *poor* financial state of the state and local economy right now, so that has been particularly reflected in our school of music budget, and *especially* the college of fine arts.

R: I see. Now, if you had the *chance* to improve those challenges one at a time, which do you think you would like to improve *immediately* in your program?

S: It would obviously, again be *funding*, having the *resources* to purchase the things necessary, not necessarily things necessary, but the *latest* and the *newest* in technologies and materials.

R: Right. If you have money you can do a lot of things. I understand, thank you. So let's go to my second research question, your ideal vision, ideal piano pedagogy program. If you were going to build up your own idealized piano pedagogy program, what kind of vision would you *dream* about?

S: [Again, I think, having those *unlimited* resources, if you have the resources available, you can make those things, those visions, those dreams realized, and so being able to *have* those resources. Another thing I think I would dream about in terms of my vision for an ideal pedagogy program would be the ability to *have* state of the art facilities and technologies. (.) the latest in technology, that sort of thing. And, (.) again, this might be a little bit *esoteric* and *abstract* thinking, but if I'm dreaming of the perfect pedagogy program, I also must be *dreaming* of thriving artistic communities, not only in the United States, but *around the world*, because when that's occurring, we know that students are going to be successful in terms of *placing* jobs and being successful financially when they leave the walls of our school.

R: That's right. That's a dream, a *big dream*. So when you're seeing this dream, what kind of possible *obstacles* would you think would happen?

S: Obstacles, (N.n) well as I mentioned earlier, *money* can fix most of these obstacles, and so being able to have those resources *available*, I think being able to *communicate* the need for the arts and a *passion* about the arts will sort of have that domino effect, and hopefully the community surrounding the university will support that idea that the arts, are, indeed important.

R: So you think *money* is the possible obstacle for the dream, right?

S: I think so. It sounds *horrible*, but I believe that truly, as they say, money makes the *world* go around.

R: Right, that's the realistic part. So do you have any possible *solutions* for this?

S: Again, as I mentioned earlier, we're constantly seeking both *external* and *internal* funding sources from corporate *grants*, all sorts of things, private *donations* of individuals who *feel* music and particularly piano, and piano teaching. So our piano faculty are constantly *seeking* out those individuals, both alums of the university as well as important figures in the *region* who would be willing to put money forward to see, perhaps, if their *legacy*, the piano pedagogy program, could continue and thrive. (.) Another possible obstacle we face is that our particular region is a rather *poor* economic area. We have a very *high* concentration of *outstanding* performance institutions,

many of which do *not* offer *pedagogy* programs, but being able to compete with them in terms of money and scholarships, it's always a challenge.

R: That's true, that's true, very much so. Thank you, so my last question. Some research, some people suggest that performance and pedagogy degrees should *combine* together, some suggest those two degrees should *separate*. In your ideal program, what kind of degree would you offer for the different levels, undergraduate, graduate, doctoral, what do you think?

S: For the pedagogy degree? (.) Well I think the pedagogy coursework should be *part* of the curriculum for an undergraduate piano *performance major*, but I think, again, being able to *specialize* in those degrees at the masters and doctoral level is important. (.) But if I step back a bit, I think I must admit I'm a realist, but I'm also a dreamer, and when you *combine* those things, I think it's important that we note that as performers, (.) very *few* of piano performance graduates will reach the concert stage as their primary form of their income, so I think we have to understand that at the piano *major*, you're going to be teaching, and so pedagogy degrees, I think, are very *valuable*. I believe there should be more comprehensive degree programs in that students must *major* not only in performance but also *pedagogy* and *collaborative* piano, and that's just a *beautiful* paradigm, because we as pianists *must* do all of those things. Performers must be *collaborators*, we must be accompanists, and we're obviously going to be teachers, and so I think it's really important that those things are *combined*.

R: So you think that at the undergraduate level, you think the performance major is better, and the masters and doctoral level you would suggest combining those degrees, am I right?

S: *Perhaps*. I think the undergraduate student *must be* enrolled in pedagogy coursework, but I think it's important for students at that level to *continue* building their, but I think the *specialization* of the pedagogy coursework is perhaps most *suited* for the masters and doctoral level.

R: I see. Ok, so that's all I have to ask you about. Thank you so much!

S: You are welcome.

Interview with Subject T

R: Thank you so much for your interview today. I'd like to let you know that the (school's) piano pedagogy program has been selected as one of the top 20 university programs by a group of *people*. Congratulations. I'd like to invite you to think about what kind of *characteristics* made people vote for this result?

S: (N.n) Well, I have to say I was a little *surprised* that we were considered at the *top*. That was very nice. I'm very flattered. (.)-I think there are a couple of reasons. One is that we do have some *very* strong piano faculty here in *performance*. A number of our students have worked with people like (person) and others. So we've *attracted* some very strong *performers* who have also worked with me as class piano TAs and teaching secondary students, and they've been able to get *good jobs*. I think that's *one* way that the word is out that we have a strong *package* for a strong performer who's also interested in teaching. And of course some of our students are also teaching in private studios here in town. (.)I'm sure a lot of people in the field of pedagogy also know *my name* through MTNA, class piano etc., and that *helps*. Plus the (city) has a lot to offer in terms of teaching opportunities for students who want to do some teaching either as a TA or *outside* the university, and I think that experience has been helpful to them. So I guess I would say all of those *factors*, and the *strength* of the university as a whole, have contributed. We have a very strong graduate program, not just in music, and students can take courses in other areas outside of music.

R: Yes, it has a very good *reputation*. So what kind of degrees do you offer for the pedagogy students?

S: It's actually a very *small* program and we *don't* have a lot of students compared to a place like Oklahoma which is, *as* you know, a *huge* program. Just a few do the program, and the only degree is a master in music. (.) Officially, I think it's called master of music in piano performance with a *pedagogy* emphasis, and it is very similar to the performance degree, so one has to be a very *strong* performer to get admitted. There are some programs where a person with a lot of *teaching experience* who hasn't done as much playing could get in, but ours is *restrictive* because of the high level of performance expected. So one can do the masters degree with a pedagogy emphasis. As I said, it's quite similar to the performance degree. The basic theory and history requirements are *identical*. The difference is that students are required to take *both* semesters of pedagogy (and we have just two semesters), plus two semesters of *practicum* which is supervised teaching with assistance from me, and, in addition to their masters orals, which all students do, they do a final *project*. Here they have the option of using a regular full masters *recital* as the project, or it could be some kind of *pedagogy document*, such as a workbook on improvisation or a videotaped *workshop*, or even a *combination*, such as a half recital and a small paper. (In one case a student did a half solo recital and a half accompanying recital, because that was the area she wanted to work in.) So there's quite a bit of *flexibility* there.

R: So do you have a bachelors degree in pedagogy?

S: No, we have no doctorate in pedagogy, and we have no undergraduate degree in pedagogy and we won't. (.) Since I'm the *only* person teaching pedagogy and supervising all the piano classes, it's as much as I can do. But there is an *option* that a number of our DMA students have been taking advantage of, actually *two* options. One is that if they come to (school) as a doctoral student with a masters degree from *another* university. They can actually obtain a masters in pedagogy *concurrently* with the DMA in performance. A *lot* of the DMA credits will count

toward the masters in pedagogy, such as piano lit, music history etc. (.) And they can actually use one of their doctoral recitals for the final project, so it's really a kind of *short cut* for them. And if they are a TA, of course, they get a lot of *feedback* from me on their *teaching*, and they also take the two semesters of pedagogy and the two semesters of practicum, and then do a masters *orals* in pedagogy along with their DMA requirements. We've had a number of students who have done that, and it seems to be a good way for them to get *more* pedagogy training and *experience*.

R: So you mean they can *combine* the masters in pedagogy and the DMA?

S: They can *combine* the masters in pedagogy with the DMA, but *only* if they aren't doing a masters in piano at the (school), because you *cannot* have *two* master of music degrees in piano from the (school), you can only have *one*. (.) So if they come from Korea or some other university in the United States and *already* have a masters in piano, they can add a second masters in pedagogy as they do their DMA. It sounds a little unusual, but it has worked.

There's one *other* option I should mention for DMA students. About four years ago we *instituted* something called *secondary* areas for DMAs (and these can be in a number of areas). We did this because we found that performance majors who got a *job* were often asked to teach other things *besides* just piano, or voice, or trombone, or whatever their instrument was. They might have to teach music *history*, music *theory*, organ, conducting, composition, or anything else depending on their strengths, and, of course, pedagogy. So DMA students who choose to do a secondary area give *fewer* recitals (I think they have three recitals instead of five), but they do a *certain* amount of additional coursework in that *area*, and the area could be music history, theory, composition, or it could be "music education and *pedagogy*." so a student taking that program would take the pedagogy courses and perhaps the practicum, and they would also have to take some *graduate* level music education courses. Then their oral exam for the DMA would *include* a music education faculty member. So they're not getting a masters in pedagogy, but they're getting a DMA in piano with a *secondary* area in music education and pedagogy.

R: Very nice, and very *flexible*.

S: It is very flexible, and I think it's been *helpful* to students that want kind of a broad training.

R: Yes, find their own *interests*.

S: Exactly.

R: At the *undergraduate* level, do you offer pedagogy *courses*?

S: I wish we *could* offer separate pedagogy courses for undergraduates, and when I first came here 20 years ago, we had *two* pedagogy courses and they were offered alternate years. The first year was Pedagogy I, and the second year was Pedagogy II, and we had a few students who actually took both years. (.) Both course numbers were at the 5000 level, which means they can be *taken* by upper division undergraduates (juniors and seniors), or by *graduate* students (either masters or doctoral students). From time to time we even had a few independent teachers enroll, with my permission, for continuing education credits. (.) So you get kind of a mixed class, but it worked. Then when we converted to semesters, we had to revise all our courses, so we created two different courses – one for undergraduates and one for graduates. But we *found* that there were not enough students to *support* both courses, because, with budget *cuts*, the university is more and more strict about *low* enrollments. If a course is under-enrolled, it will be cancelled. (.) I tried combining the two numbers (3000 and 5000) into one class, but it was too *complicated*, because the computer considered it two classes and they were too small. So I had to *combine* them into one, two-semester course at the 5000 level, and I can only offer it every other year,

because that's the only way we can be sure of getting enough students. It's too bad, but it was the only solution that would work here.

R: Better than nothing, there.

S: Yes, it is, and I generally have, and will probably continue to have, *mainly* graduate students in the class. However, when NASM reviewed our accreditation three years ago, they did mandate that we require some pedagogy for all *undergraduate* performance majors, which we didn't have at the time. There was naturally some resistance to this in some areas, but for piano it was pretty simple to add a *one*-semester requirement to the undergraduate curriculum. (Other areas are having to work out some kind of pedagogy offering for other instruments, so that's a little harder.) But for piano it was pretty easy, so either in their junior or senior year, all of the *undergrads* are now going to have to take *one* semester of pedagogy, normally the first semester, so we'll see how it works. However, we *don't* have a *lot* of undergraduate piano majors. We have a lot *more* at the graduate level because there's more *financial* support for graduate students, and we support a lot of TAs by offering a lot of piano classes for non-music majors. Those are funded by the College of Liberal Arts because they serve the non-majors and provide fine arts credits. (.) So we have about 23 sections of class piano for non-music majors. And those really *support* the TAs.

R: I think a music school is mainly a graduate school.

S: Very *heavily* so. And of the undergraduates, some are music education majors, and some music therapy, and they don't have the same requirements for *pedagogy*. So that's just what the population is. It's become more that way since I came. Before, the piano majors were largely from (school), we didn't have a lot of *out-of-state* students, and we didn't have a lot of TA support. As we've grown, we've gotten a huge *international* enrollment, more *high-powered* instructors, and we've recruited some very strong students from all over the world.

R: I'm from Taiwan and I know that (school) is a very good graduate school. It has an international reputation.

S: We have a lot of Taiwanese students, including a number of my TAs, as well as Korean students, some from Mainland China, Russia, Europe, and some from Latin America. So it's quite an interesting mix.

R: How *many* pedagogy students do you have in your program?

S: You mean pedagogy majors?

R: Pedagogy *majors*.

S: It's very small, as I said. (N.n) I have one or two that are kind of in limbo. (They are DMA students who started the pedagogy masters but have had some problems, and probably aren't going to finish, so I won't count them.) One of the DMA students who has one more year is completing a secondary area in music education and pedagogy. (.) But I don't really have anybody who's active in the masters program right now. At most, it's maybe one or two a *year*. (There was one student who applied to enter the pedagogy program this fall, but the other piano faculty *didn't* feel that his playing was *strong* enough, so he was not admitted.)

R: Thank you. Now could you talk about the curriculum content you offer in your courses?

S: There are *two* semesters, two credits per semester. In the first semester we survey important piano *methods* and teaching repertoire. We generally use the (School) Music Teacher's Association Syllabus as a *guide* because it has *11* different levels of repertoire. It's a good way to kind of get them acquainted with some of the early level *teaching* materials, and they do a lot of *class presentations* on the music they're looking at, which includes *ensemble* music. We also look at class piano methods, keyboard skills texts, etc.. (N.n) We also explore approaches to

teaching technique, reading skills, memorization (including mapping), improvisation, and such topics as Dalcroze eurhythmics. And I sometimes *pair* the students to give joint presentations. They also write a *report* at the end of the year, typically a book review or a small research paper on an area that's of *interest* to them. I give them a big bibliography. In the fall, as we're focusing on the *earlier* levels, I bring in a *Yamaha* music teacher to talk about the Yamaha program, and a *Suzuki* teacher to talk about Suzuki. And we take a field trip to one of our independent teachers in town who has a *really* interesting studio with a *computer* lab. She's very well organized, and she talks about the business side of teaching, bookkeeping, the theory games that she uses and the motivational *strategies* she has devised. It's wonderful and it's always a *highlight* for them. (.) They must also do *12* observations during the semester, which is 15 weeks. I give them questions to answer as they write up their observations. (Unfortunately, we do not have a preparatory program on campus, and that's one of our limitations. We really *won't* have that because we just don't have the *staff* for it. We don't have the studio *space* to teach, and we don't have enough parking.) But they can go downtown, which is three miles away, where they have some *wonderful* faculty and they've been very nice about letting my students *observe*. So they can watch some really good teachers at *all* levels and write up what they see. They can also go to private studios (I give them a list of independent teachers in the *area* that welcome observers), other community music schools, or they can visit Yamaha *classes* or Suzuki programs. Sometimes they observe piano classes, especially if they've never had any experience with class piano, so I usually send them to some of the very experienced *TAs*, maybe a third year TA. They can also observe my classes, of course, and I occasionally have a private student that they can come and observe. (.) So it works out *pretty well*, and I think it's a very valuable part of the curriculum. Even though I'm not there *with* them, and we can't really discuss it as a group, I still think it *helps* them become more aware and they get a lot of ideas for teaching. (.) And a *lot* of the students are also teaching, and that's very helpful. Some are *TAs*, and we have a lot of commuters from the (city) that teach students at home, or teach in one of the community music schools in town. (.) If they don't, I can usually find a student for them to teach, but it's not a *perfect* situation because I don't have a whole bunch of *children* that need teachers that I can just sign them up with. Sometimes they can work that out, sometimes they can *assist* in a piano class, and work with the instructor, and that's a useful experience.

R: So since they gain teaching by observing or teaching the college class piano, how do they get *one-on-one* teaching experience, by peer teaching in class?

S: Well most of the *TAs* also teach *private* lessons (they get an extra fee for that, and the pupils are primarily *college* students). These include secondary piano students, like the voice majors who need to have a year of private lessons with a TA after completing class piano. (.) We also offer private lessons for elective *non-music* majors. (.) They're not beginners, but they range from early intermediate to very advanced and they study with *TAs*. So we don't have an *automatic* opportunity for them to teach young beginners, which is one of the *drawbacks*. If they're able to do it in their own studio, it's great, but if not, they have to try to find ways to do that. The *observations* are helpful, but this is just one of the limitations of the program.

R: I'd like to ask you about the *technology*. How is technology used in your program?

S: *Not* very much. It's not one of my strengths, though I *wish* it were. I've tried learning *Finale* and *Sibelius* and other programs, but it's a combination of limited *time* and having so much else to do. Of course, all the students have access to the internet, and we do have a *good* computer lab, so if they want to learn it, they can take *courses* in MIDI technology and notation software and all of the things that are available. We also have a disk player in the lab, and we make sure

all of the TAs know how to use it. They use that *a lot* in their classes because the class piano books come with disks, so they use MIDI Disks, or sometimes just CDs, to give the students an accompaniment. (.) A few of the TAs have taken courses in *web design* and are really good at it, and those that *have* can use that in their teaching. (.) Some of them also know PowerPoint. I don't, but we *do* have an overhead projector and transparencies!

R: Technology goes so fast. It's so hard to update all the time.

S: I just *can't* do it, but I wish I could.

R: I'd like to go back to the *curriculum* a little bit. Do you have any preferred *textbooks* that you use in your class?

S: [I *haven't* found a text that I'm completely happy with. I do use Marianne Uszler's book (The Well Tempered Keyboard Teacher) because it has some good information in it, and in the past I have used the *James Lyke* book (Creative Piano Teaching), which also has some very good chapters. I also put together a pretty substantial *course packet*, which includes my own bibliography and some miscellaneous documents and handouts that I have *compiled* over the years, like interview forms and studio guidelines, plus some *articles* from *American Music Teacher*, and *Keyboard Companion*, some *chapters* from the Lyke book, and one or two things from the *Bastien* book. (I did use the Bastien book one year, and I thought it was good for the undergraduates, but I wanted a little more *depth* for the graduates.) I've looked at Martha Baker's book, and I think it has some interesting stuff too, but I don't think it's right for me. We use *selected* readings and a lot of stuff from the course packet as our text.

R: Now, shifting a little bit, how are the *finances* in your program?

S: Do you mean in terms of the business aspects of a studio, or how I pay for the program? What do you mean by finances?

R: Do you have any *specific* budgets?

S: I *don't*, really, although I just found out that I *can* get a little money for bringing in guest presenters. (I used to have to get them to come for *free*, and they were very nice about that, but this year I am going to try to get at least a little honorarium for the guests.) We *don't* really have a budget because we don't have a *preparatory* program, and we don't pay teachers to teach. We just don't have the capability to do that.

R: I know a lot of schools, because they have a preparatory program, they can generate money from there.

S: [Yeah. We just don't have that.

R: OK, so we talked about curriculum, one more. You are an expert in the piano pedagogy field, for the younger group of doctoral students, or whatever, what would you recommend if they wanted to be good pedagogy faculty in the future. What kind of *qualification or degree* do you feel is best to suit this position?

S: They really need to have *experience* teaching students at different levels. That's why I'm really pleased that a *lot* of our doctoral students, besides being TAs and teaching classes and private lessons at the university, can also teach at one of the music schools in *town* and get a lot of experience with young students. It's really helpful and gives them a lot of insight, and certainly the pedagogy *course* is important. Some of our *top* TAs have also been able to help out at various times when I've had other administrative duties or I've been on sabbatical, so we've had some of the very *experienced* TAs take over the TA program. They don't teach pedagogy, but they supervise the other TAs and help the new TAs get acclimated, and that's been *useful* for them as well. They've also taught my *advanced* keyboard skills class, which I usually teach. I think that has been a very useful experience for them. *Also*, we have another program at our

university which a number of the TAs have taken, called *Preparing Future Faculty*. It's an *interdisciplinary* program TAs or any graduate students can sign up for. It's offered through the Center for Teaching and Learning. They do a lot of reading on *collaborative* learning and other aspects of teaching and learning. It's a really wonderful program, because they learn about *teaching* in a universal sense, not just how to teach piano, but how to communicate better with students, how to *organize* lesson plans, etc. They also get feedback from each other and from their *instructor*, and often a student who's a biology major will work with a music major, so they can get beyond the content and really analyze the teaching (.). Part of the program includes some type of *internship*. They have to *assist* a professor in their department, and they are *mentored* by the professor. Or they could choose a different kind of college – perhaps a small school in town – where they would get a totally *different* kind of teaching experience. They also perform a faculty role, such as participate in a faculty meeting, and do some kind of *service project* for the department. I've mentored three students in the past, all TAs, and they have worked with me on developing our TA orientation in the fall, or compiling materials for teaching functional skills. One also met with the music education faculty to find out more about what the music education majors need in the way of keyboard skills, then shared this information with the other TAs. (.) So that's been a very good program, and that kind of experience would be *great* if other schools offered it, but not every school does. And technology is certainly important, because today they do need to know more technology than I did when I was a graduate student. *Writing* skills and *speaking* skills are also important.

R: Do you have any *preferred* degree that you think is better?

S: I think it just depends on the *program*. Some schools offer a PhD in music education, and some schools offer a DMA. I think it *really* depends on who you're working with, who the *faculty* are, and what kind of program they have. There's a lot to be said for the PhD, where they really develop strong research skills, and for some kinds of jobs that would be *very* helpful.

R: So we have talked about the curriculum and status of your program, among all these things, which one do you think is the *largest* challenge you are facing in your program?

S: Well I guess these are all *related*: not having a *preparatory* program and being the *only* person doing class piano and pedagogy. Those are related. In addition, I am not currently teaching *young* kids myself. I did that for a good five years, and that's all I taught, but now I'm really too involved with supervising the TAs and with my own teaching responsibilities to be able to keep that up. That's why I *rely* on other teachers who are teaching pre-college students as *resources*. So I can't speak as much from my own current experience, and my students don't have a chance to observe a *live* teaching demonstration together at school and work with those students. I guess if you could lump those together somehow, I would call that the main *challenge*.

R: If you had the chance to improve the challenges *one* at a time, which would you resolve *immediately*?

S: I don't know. (.) I don't see any easy way to really deal with any of those things, because I *don't* think we could get another faculty member in pedagogy right now, and even if we could, I don't think we would ever have the capability of offering a *real* preparatory program. Maybe there would be a way of working out an *internship* with (person) (I've tried pursuing that before.) but would really take a lot of time, and I just *don't* think I could do it.

R: Thank you. Now, moving on to my second research question, your idealized piano pedagogy program. If you would like to build up your *own* ideal piano pedagogy program, what kind of picture would you *dream* about in your ideal program?

S: I would probably go to the University of *Oklahoma* and see what they're doing there, and do something very much *like* that. I don't think I could ever do my ideal program at (school). The *infrastructure* is just not there. But I think there are schools that could. I *visited* Oklahoma, and I was impressed not only by the fact that they have *several* people teaching pedagogy and class piano, but also because the applied faculty is *very much* committed, to and very *supportive* of the pedagogy program. That doesn't happen at every school, because applied faculty sometimes have different agendas. So having *lots* of people involved in the program, wonderful resources, a pedagogy *library* (we really don't have the space for that except for what's in my studio), a *room* where students can try out stuff on an electronic piano, check out class piano books, use the computer, watch themselves on videotape, etc. would make a big difference. (.) I think *Cincinnati* (CCM) has that kind of quality, as does *Oklahoma*. I'm sure there are others, but we simply don't. We're bursting at the seams, and we don't have the space or the faculty to do it.

R: So what kind of possible obstacles do you see?

S: [Well, that's what I've just said: *space* is an obstacle, and *staffing* is an obstacle. Space is a big obstacle, because I have 11 TAs sharing *one* TA office, and that's a lot. And even then we're running out of space, because we have 45 full time faculty and about 45 adjunct, and the practice rooms are *heavily* in use, so we've had to restrict the hours that non-majors can practice because it's too *crowded*. I guess it's just part of being a large university in an urban environment.)

R: Do you have any possible solution for this?

S: [No. I *really* don't. (The directors asked for an additional building, but we have no idea if or when that might happen. It could take 40 years. I just don't know, but probably not while I'm alive.)

R: OK, thank you. My last question is, in your *ideal* program, some researchers suggest that pedagogy should *separate* from performance degrees, and some researchers suggest they should *combine* as one degree. In your opinion, what kind of degree would you offer in your program?

S: (N.n) I think it would be good to *combine* pedagogy and performance, because you do want a certain level of performing ability. But you have to have performance faculty who *understand* what *aspects* of the performance skills are most important for the teacher, because you want someone who is a *strong* player, but not just someone with fast fingers who's *unable* to communicate what they're doing to a student. So that's why I say it takes a *special* kind of performance faculty who really understands and is really committed to pedagogy.

R: So do you think you would offer the combined degree from the *bachelors* to the *doctoral*?

S: We're not going to add any pedagogy degrees, either at the bachelors or doctoral level. Our masters degree is already a *combined* degree, *heavily* performance with a little pedagogy. I think that's probably the most we can do, and I have no plans to expand it.

R: How about the bachelors degree?

S: *No*, I don't think it would be any value *in* adding a bachelors degree in pedagogy. The students really need the bachelors in performance just to develop their piano *skills* and build a foundation for their musicianship. A pedagogy degree at the bachelors level wouldn't be *helpful* for our program.

R: How about the *doctoral*, in your ideal program?

S: Well, it would be something like *Oklahoma*, with *everything* they have. Having more faculty, having a supportive *performance faculty*, having a resource lab, having a preparatory program on campus with lots of performing *opportunities*, having everyone teaching classes and teaching kids and teaching adults. We just don't have that here, and we *won't*.

R: Thank you very much. You are very helpful and very nice!

REFERENCES

- Alexander, R. (1993). Educational for pianist who enters college in the mid 90s. In R. Chronister & P. Meader (Eds.), *Proceedings and reference of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy* (pp.41-42). Los Angeles, CA: The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy.
- Alfred [Computer software]. (2003). Van Nuys, CA: Alfred Pub. Co.
- Audacity [Computer software]. (2006). Fremont, CA: VA Software Corporation.
- Avery, J. S. (2002). Vision 20/20 and in-service education for music teachers (Doctoral dissertation, Eastman School of music, The University of Rochester, 2002). *Digital Dissertations*, 62(11), 3721.
- Baker, M. J. (Ed.). (1981). *Proceedings and reference of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy*. Princeton, N. J.: The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy.
- Baker-Jordan, M. (2004). *Practical piano pedagogy*. Miami: Warner Bros.
- Band in a Box [computer software]. (2006). Victoria, B.C., Canada: PG Music.
- Banowetz, J. (1973). The college piano major. In J.W. Bastein (Ed.), *How to teach piano successfully*. Park Ridge, IL: General Words and Music.
- Bashaw, D. R. (1980). *The evolution of philosophies and techniques of piano pedagogy from 1750 to 1900 traced through the teachings of C. P. E. Bach, Clementi, Czerny, Chopin and Les Chetizky*. Unpublished masters thesis, California State University, Fullerton, California.
- Bastien, J. (1977). *How to teach piano successfully*. Park Ridge, Ill: General Words
- Bastien, J. W. (1988). *How to teach piano successfully* (3rd ed.). San Diego, CA: Neil A. Kjos.
- Berenson, G., Csurgai-Schmitt, J., DeVan, W., Elkiss, M., Fink, S., Lehrer, P.A., Lister- Sink, B., Mayerovitch, R., Rosen, N., & Savage, D. (2002). *A symposium for pianists and teachers*. Dayton, Ohio: Heritage Music Press.
- Boardman, R.C. (1953). *A history of theories of teaching piano techniques*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- Brandt, R. M. (1972). *Studying behavior in natural settings*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Brubaker, D. (1997). A history and critical analysis of piano methods published in the United States from 1796 to 1995 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1996). *Digital Dissertations*, 57(08), 3436.

- Buchanan, G. (1964). Skills of piano performance in the preparation of music educators. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 12, 134-38.
- Cameron, J. (1983). Humanistic teaching and the piano teacher: the development of a model of the processes of humanistic teaching and a consideration of its implication for the piano teacher (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1983). *Digital Dissertations*, 44(03), 697.
- Camp, S. L. (1976). The status of the private piano teacher in music education in selected southern central states (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1975). *Digital Dissertations*, 53(11), 5622.
- Chang, Y. (1985). An analysis of the backgrounds and leadership styles of music administrators in higher education (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1984). *Digital Dissertations*, 45(08), 2433.
- Charoenwongse, C. (1999). Undergraduate piano pedagogy course offerings in Thai universities (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1998). *Digital Dissertations*, 59(12), 4311.
- Christiansen, P. A. (2002). A music theater program for Indiana University (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 2002). *Digital Dissertations*, 62(11), 3614.
- Chronister, R. (1988). The national conference on piano pedagogy: Whither and wherefore. *The American Music Teacher*, 37(3), 18-21.
- Chronister, R. (1995). Opening marks. In R. Chronister & L. Timmons (Eds.), *Proceedings of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy* (pp. 23-24). Princeton, NJ: The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy.
- Chronister, R., & Timmons, L. (1991). (Eds.). *Proceedings and reference of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy*. Princeton, NJ: The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy.
- Clarfield, I. (1996). *From mystery to mastery*. Van Nuys, CA: Alfred Pub. Co.
- Clark, F. (1992). *Questions and answers*. Northfield, Ill: Instrumentalist Co.
- Coats, S. (2006). *Thinking as you play*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Colby, R. (1993). A vision of the future. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 117, 92-101.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Duke, R. (2005). *Intelligent music teaching*. Austin, TX: Learning and Behavior.

- Farwell, G. H. (1964). Curriculum planning in music education. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 12, 231-234.
- Fast, B. R. (1997). Marguerite Miller's contributions to piano pedagogy (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1997). *Digital Dissertations*, 58(03), 630.
- Finale [Computer software]. (2006). Seattle: eMedia.
- Francis, O. S. (1993). Guidelines for teaching piano pedagogy based on the developmental teaching philosophy of Max W. Camp (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1992). *Digital Dissertations*, 53(11), 3836.
- Friedlander, J. L. (1997). Curricular and pedagogical vision in dance teacher preparation programs in higher education: Toward a partnership in general national and arts education reform (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1997). *Digital Dissertations*, 58(06), 1967.
- Garrison, P. K. (1985). An investigation of the curricular content of instrumental music education methods courses at selected colleges and universities (Doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1985). *Digital Dissertations*, 46(05), 1122
- Gellrich, M. and Parncutt, R. (1998). Piano technique and fingering in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: Bringing a forgotten method back to life. *British Journal of Music Education*, 115(1), 5-23.
- Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity*. Mill Valley, CA: The Sociological Press.
- Gray, M. E. (1998). Teacher or performer: Role identification among piano majors. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1998). *Digital Dissertations*, 59(04), 1104.
- Hang, S. (1991). Pedagogical research: Searching for an identity and a discipline. In R. Chronister & L. Timmons (Eds.), *Proceedings and reference of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy* (pp.107-108). Princeton, NJ: The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy.
- Hilley, M., & Olson, L.F. (2006). *Piano for the developing musician*. Belmont, CA: West Publishing.
- Holland, S. (1997). The future of piano pedagogy. *Piano Life*, 2, 12-14.
- Holmes, K. M. (1992). The concept of vision in American school hopes of the future: A vision for the Palestinian educational system (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco, 1998). *Digital Dissertations*, 59(06), 1857.
- Home Concert [Computer software]. (2000). Rehoboth, MA: Time Warp Technologies.

- James, M. J. (1995). The evolution of pedagogical thought in American piano teaching of the twentieth century (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1995). *Digital Dissertations*, 55(07), 1735.
- Johnson, V. L. (2003). A survey of undergraduate piano pedagogy core course content (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 2002). *Digital Dissertations*, 63(10), 3503.
- Kowalchyk, G. (1989). A descriptive profile of piano pedagogy instructors at American colleges and universities (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1989). *Digital Dissertations*, 50(03), 643.
- Lancaster, E. L. (1979). The development and evaluation of a hypothetical model program for the education of the college and university group piano instructor (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1978). *Digital Dissertations*, 39(08), 4583.
- Larsen, E. G. (1997). Preparing musicians and teachers for their music future-the role of the musician in the twenty-first century: Rethinking the core. *Proceedings of the 72nd Annual Meeting of National Association of Schools of Music* (pp.115-143). Reston, VA: National Association of Schools of Music.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. New York: Sage.
- Lloyd-Watts, V., & Bigler, C.L. (1995). *Ornamentation*. Van Nuys, CA: Alfred Pub.
- Lyke, J. (1977). *Creative piano teaching*. Champaign, Ill: Stipes Pub. Co.
- Lyke, J. B. (1968). An investigation of class piano programs in the six state universities of Illinois and recommendations for their improvement (Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado, 1968). *Digital Dissertations*, 29(04), 1245.
- Lyman, J. P. (1991). Administration aspects of intern teaching in piano pedagogy courses (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1991). *Digital Dissertations*, 52(04), 1248.
- Magrath, J. (1995). *Pianist's guide to standard teaching and performance literature*. Van Nuys, CA: Alfred Publishing. Co.
- McArthur, V. H. (1992). Are computers doing the job? The effectiveness and attitudes surrounding microcomputer instructional use in the private music studio. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning*, 3(2), 24-30.
- McCain, C. J. F. (1994). Current piano teaching practices in music store education programs (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, 1993). *Digital Dissertations*, 54(11), 4024.
- MIDIsaurus [Computer software]. (1999). Redmond, WA: Town 4 Kids.

- Milliman, A. (1992). A survey of graduate piano pedagogy core course offerings (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1992). *Digital Dissertations*, 53(03), 749.
- Monsour, S. (1962). The establishment and early development of beginning piano classes in the public schools, 1915-1930 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1959). *Digital Dissertations*, 20(12), 4680.
- Montandon, M. I. (1999). Trends in piano pedagogy as reflected by the proceedings of the National Conference on piano pedagogy (1981-1995) (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1998). *Digital Dissertations*, 59(09), 3387.
- Mouley, G. J. (1978). *Educational research: The art and science of investigation*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Mozilla [Computer software]. (2005). Mountain View, CA: Mozilla.
- Music Ace [Computer software]. (2003). Chicago: Harmonic Vision.
- Music Teachers National Association (1990). *Pedagogical training of music teachers: A survey report*. Cincinnati, OH: Music Teachers National Association,
- National Association of Schools of Music. *Handbook, 2003-2004*. Reston, VA: NASM.
- Norman, J. L. (1969). A historical study of the changes in attitudes toward the teaching of piano technique from 1800 to the present time (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968). *Digital Dissertations*, 29(10), 3633.
- Obeid, K. Y. (1998). Between the reality of the past and the hopes of the future: A vision for the Palestinian educational system (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco, 1998). *Digital Dissertations*, 59(06), 1857.
- Paganelli, Y. (1981). A comparison of curricula requirements for a student majoring in piano in selected conservatories and universities in the Americas (Doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, 1980). *Digital Dissertations*, 42(04), 1367.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Performer [Computer software]. (2004). Garden Grove, CA: QRS
- Pettigre, A. M. (1985). Contextual research: A natural way to link theory and practice. In E. Wawson (Ed.), *Doing research that is useful for theory and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Renfrow, K. D. (1991). The development and evaluation of objectives for educating graduate piano pedagogy students to use computer and keyboard technology (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1991). *Digital Dissertation*, 52(06), 2063.

- Richards, W. H. (1967). Trends of piano class instruction 1815-1962 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri at Kansas City, 1962). *Digital Dissertations*, 28(02), 712.
- Robert, W. (1964). Piano study in Soviet-Russian schools of music. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 12, 199-211.
- Roberts, L. (1983). Implications for curriculum and instruction. In M.A. White (Ed.), *The future of electronic learning* (pp. 63-69). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest system for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361-382.
- Schmidt, C.P. (1989). An investigation of undergraduate music education curriculum content. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 99, 42-56.
- Shockley, R. (2005). *A piano teacher's legacy: Selected writings by Richard Chronister*. Cincinnati, Ohio: American Music Teacher.
- Shook, T. R. (1993). The development and evaluation of competencies and experiences for teaching undergraduate piano pedagogy courses (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1993). *Digital Dissertations*, 54(04), 1279.
- Sibelius [Computer software]. (2004). Walnut Creek, CA: Sibelius.
- Slocum, W. L., Empey, T., & Swanson, H. S. (1956). Increasing response to questionnaires and structured interviews. *American Sociological Review*, 21, 221-225.
- Stake, R. E. (1978). The case study method in social inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 7, 5-8.
- Sturm, C. A., James, M., Jackson, A., & Burns, D. B. (2000/2001). Celebrating 100 years of progress in American piano teaching. *American Music Teacher*, 50(2), 29-32.
- Thompson, D. B. (1997). Piano music in the south during the Civil War period, 1855-1870 (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1997). *Digital Dissertations*, 58(03), 642.
- Trice, P. J. (1988). Gray Thomas Perry, piano performer and pedagogue (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1988). *Digital Dissertations*, 49(06), 1310.
- Uszler, M. & Larimer, F. (1986). *The piano pedagogy major in the college curriculum: A handbook of information and guidelines. Part II: The graduate piano pedagogy major*. Princeton, NJ: National Conference on Piano Pedagogy.
- Uszler, M. (1992). Research on the teaching of keyboard skills. In R. Coldwell, (Ed.), *Handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 584-591). New York: Schirmer.

- Uszler, M., & Larimer, F. (1984). *The piano pedagogy major in the college curriculum: A handbook of information and guidelines. Part I: The undergraduate piano pedagogy major*. Princeton, NJ: National Conference on Piano pedagogy.
- Uszler, M., Gordon, S., & Mach, E. (1999). *The well-tempered keyboard teacher*. New York: Schirmer.
- Uszler. (1985). Issues in piano pedagogy. *American Music Teacher*, 34(3), 10-13.
- Willis, J. M. (2002). Moving beyond the training environment to a vision of technology integration in the classroom curriculum: A case study (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 2002). *Digital Dissertations*, 62(07), 2395.
- Wolfersberger, M. M. (1986). A study and analysis of selected aspects of the piano teaching profession (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1986). *Digital Dissertations*, 48(07), 1695.